ACPL ITEM
DISCARDED

274.15
Killen
Ecclesiastical
history of Ireland

K55e
v.1
1867435
STORAGE

M.

DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS FROM POCKET

PUBLIC LIBRARY
FORT WAYNE AND ALLEN COUNTY, IND.

ALLEN COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY

ACPL ITEM
DISCARDED

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

https://archive.org/details/ecclesiasticalhi0001wdki

1785

THE

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY OF IRELAND.

FROM THE EARLIEST PERIOD TO THE PRESENT TIMES.

BY

W. D. KILLEN, D.D.,

PRESIDENT OF ASSEMBLY'S COLLEGE, BELFAST, AND
PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

"Tho' slavery's cloud o'er thy morning hath hung
The full noon of freedom shall beam round thee yet."

V.1

VOLUME I.

THE
NEWBERRY
LIBRARY
CHICAGO

London:
MACMILLAN AND CO.
1875.

1867435

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY OF IRELAND.

1867435

Dedication.

TO MRS. HENRY GAMBLE, OF ASHBURN.

MADAM,—I know not any one to whom I may so appropriately dedicate these volumes as to the generous lady who founded "The Gamble Library" in the College over which I have the honour to preside. The rare and valuable works contained in that collection have supplied no small portion of the information presented to the reader in the following pages. It is but due to you thus publicly to acknowledge that the literary toil expended on the preparation of this History has been greatly stimulated and encouraged by your munificence. That you may be long spared to honour the Lord with your substance, and that your last comforts may be your sweetest comforts, is,

MADAM,

The earnest prayer of your obliged servant,

THE AUTHOR.

COLLEGE PARK, BELFAST,
October 1st, 1875.

PREFACE.

In the following work an attempt is made to illustrate a section of the history of the Christian Church which has hitherto been very imperfectly explored. As many of its transactions have been variously described, and have excited keen discussion, it has been found necessary to sift the evidence throughout, and to recognise no fact which cannot be established by direct or circumstantial testimony. In every case of consequence, care has been taken to give the authorities for the statements advanced; so that all, who desire more fully to investigate the subject, may have an opportunity of judging for themselves as to the credit of the witnesses who vouch for the conclusions adopted. To facilitate reference, the date of the publication of the volume quoted, as well as the page, is generally indicated.

The reader may perceive that, throughout this work, primary use has been made of contemporary information. In this way the truth can be best ascertained and most satisfactorily exhibited. During the present century immense additions have been made to the materials available for the study of Irish history. A new aspect has been given to many occurrences by the publication of some poem, or memoir, or letter, or state paper, or other document, long entombed in gloomy and inaccessible manuscripts. These new materials have been carefully surveyed; and, in the following work, frequently employed.

The early Ecclesiastical History of Ireland reveals singular arrangements. As the country lay outside the bounds of the old Roman empire, its Church, when originally organized, did not come under the operation of the canons of the General Councils; and thus it was that, until a comparatively late period, it continued to differ in polity and worship from most of the other churches of Europe. But withal, in the seventh century, it enjoyed perhaps the purest spiritual light in Christendom. In this work its ancient constitution is pourtrayed; subsequent changes are explained; and an account is given of the form it presented at the time of the English invasion. We then enter on a dark and dreary period of long duration; and, when the Reformation dawns elsewhere, its rays do not reach Ireland. The extraordinary position of its Church during the reign of Elizabeth has here received special attention.

In the time of James I., when Protestantism began to be an element of importance in the country, it presented, in the northern province, a divided front; as, alongside the Established Church, there stood forth a vigorous Non-Conformity. The same diversity continues to this day. It is the object of the present work to trace the proceedings of all the religious denominations in the island; so that the reader, as he passes on from age to age, may be acquainted with their relative strength, their peculiar arrangements, and their mutual influence. In this respect the Ecclesiastical History of Ireland now submitted to the reader differs from any publication of the kind which has yet appeared. It comes down to the times in which we live; and, whilst it details the movements of the adherents of the See of Rome, it also records the operations of the various Protestant Churches.

The history of Ireland since the Reformation cannot fail to awaken deep yet melancholy interest. We here see a form of religion set up by the State, but rejected by the mass of

the population; and we find the maintenance of the dominant creed producing perpetual discord for centuries. The causes which contributed to impede the progress of the Reformed faith are minutely described; and no attempt is made to conceal the errors of either Romanists or Protestants. It is the duty of history to daguerreotype, as plainly as possible, the proceedings of the various parties in the ecclesiastical drama; and a pure theology has nothing to fear from a correct report even of the faults of its advocates.

Some of the views presented in this work may be new to many readers; but they have not been hastily adopted. The student of history should desire simply to know the truth—no matter how it may interfere with particular interests; and the writer ventures to anticipate that all who are in pursuit of information in a right spirit will not seek for it in vain in the following pages.

CONTENTS.

DEDICATION v

PREFACE vii

BOOK I.

FROM THE INTRODUCTION OF CHRISTIANITY INTO IRELAND TO THE SYNOD OF RATHBREASAIL, A.D. 1110.

CHAPTER I.

THE EARLY HISTORY OF IRELAND, AND ITS APOSTLE PATRICK.

Early colonization of Ireland—The Sacred Island—Threatened invasion by the Romans—King Cormac "turned to the adoration of God"—First planting of Christianity in Ireland, and Coelestius—Palladius sent to Ireland by Pope Celestine—His want of success—Patrick had been already in Ireland—No notice taken of him by Pope Leo I.—Patrick's Confession; his history—Not sent from Rome—Planted in Ireland the ecclesiastical arrangements of Brittany—Why Palladius unsuccessful in Ireland—The Lives of Patrick not trustworthy—Palladius and Patrick confounded—Patrick attempts the conversion of Laoghaire—His hymn—Great number of bishops ordained by Patrick in Ireland—Patrick not free from superstition—Early Irish Church used no images in worship—Did not practise the rite of Extreme Unction, and knew no Purgatory—Patrick, and the Reform of the Civil Law. . . *Page* 3—24

CHAPTER II.

FROM THE DEATH OF PATRICK TO THE DEATH OF COLUMBKILLE, A.D. 465 TO A.D. 597.

All the early Irish bishops not natives—The Welsh Church—Early prevalence of monasticism in Ireland—Monasticism of earlier growth than Christianity—Brigid and the nunnery of Kildare—Monks among the Druids—Monasteries at Armagh, Clonard, Clonfert, Bangor, &c.—Columbkille, his lineage and character—His dispute with Finnian of Moville—Battle near Sligo—The Cathach—Columbkille excommunicated—His mission to Iona—Apostle of Northern Picts—His ecclesiastical polity—Jurisdiction over bishops—His piety—His death—The Christianity of Columbkille and his contemporaries . . . . . *Page* 25–39

CHAPTER III.

FROM THE DEATH OF COLUMBKILLE TO THE DEATH OF ADAMNAN, A.D. 597 TO A.D. 704.

IRISH MISSIONARIES, IRISH SEMINARIES, AND IRISH CIVILIZATION.

Great number of monks in Ireland, and prosperity of Irish seminaries—Irish missionaries on the Continent—Columbanus; his attainments—Passes, first into Britain, and then into France—Settles in Burgundy—The discipline of his monasteries—Disputes with the French clergy about Easter—Writes to Gregory I.—His respect for Scripture—Again writes to the Pope—Offends King Thierry, and banished his dominions—Removes to Switzerland, and then passes into Italy—Settles at Bobbio—His remarkable letter to Boniface IV. —What he thought about the bishop of Rome—A truly great character—His disciple Gallus the apostle of Switzerland—Kilian, his labours and his martyrdom—Other Irish missionaries on the Continent—Fame of the Hibernian seminaries—Jealousy of Englishmen—Theodore, Adrian, and Aldhelm —Ireland had not now attained a high degree of civilization—Wars of the monks and chieftains—The clergy at length "exempted from hostings."

Page 40–55

CHAPTER IV.

FROM THE DEATH OF COLUMBKILLE TO THE DEATH OF ADAMNAN, A.D. 597 TO A.D. 704.

THE EASTER CONTROVERSY AND THE CLAIMS OF ARMAGH.

Romish missionaries arrive in England—Their character—Dispute relative to Easter and the Tonsure—Differ from the Irish in their religious rites and mode of Church government—The old British Church in Wales—Irish and British

refuse to hold communion with the Romish missionaries—Complaining letter of the archbishop of Canterbury and two other Romish prelates—Letter to the Irish from Pope Honorius—Synod of Magh-Lene—Irish deputies sent all over the Church to make inquiries respecting the keeping of Easter; their report—The Southern Irish adopt the Roman mode of keeping Easter—The epistle of Cummian relating to the Paschal Cycle—Another epistle from Rome—Some of the Northern Irish conform to the Roman observance—Thomian of Armagh—Causes of the decline of Iona—Growing importance of Armagh—Jealousy between Armagh and Downpatrick—Stories invented to support Armagh—Quarrels between monks of Patrick and Columbkille—The yellow plague and other disasters—Invasion of Ireland by king of Northumbria—Visit of Adamnan to England for the liberation of captives—Adamnan adopts the Roman mode of keeping Easter, and retires from Hy—Ascendency of the Southern Hy Niall and ruin of Aileach—Growing pretensions of Armagh—No metropolitans now in Ireland—Influence of monks from England in Ireland—Cummian's zeal for Romanism and his Penitential—The Lives of Patrick—Early Irish forms of religious service—Liturgies in Irish—Increasing superstition—Scriptures still highly valued . . . . . *Page* 56—89

CHAPTER V.

FROM THE DEATH OF ADAMNAN TO THE FIRST ATTACK OF THE NORTHMEN ON IRELAND, A.D. 704 TO A.D. 795.

Monks in Iona and Ireland conform to the Roman mode of keeping Easter—Papal supremacy not acknowledged in Ireland—Celibacy not obligatory on the Irish clergy—Irish missionaries on the Continent—The Irish bishop Clemens and his two sons—The Irishman Virgil disputes with Boniface—Virgil settles at Salzburg—Two learned Irishmen, Clemens and Albin, patronized by Charlemagne—Alcuin corresponds with Colgu of Clonmacnois—Charlemagne does not overlook Ireland—The Apostolic Succession in the Church of Ireland—No archbishops originally in Ireland—Brigid and her bishop Conlaedh—No diocesan bishops in Ireland—Presbyter abbots ordain; the case of Findchan—The Irish co-arbs—The old Irish bishops thickly planted—One bishop ordained bishops—Endowment of the monasteries—Termon-land and Herenachs—The co-arb of Patrick—His influence with the king of Ireland—His dislike of the king of Ulidia—Hugh Allan, king of Ireland, promotes the ambitious views of the abbot of Armagh—Dispute between the monks of Durrow and Clonmacnois—The Cain Phatraig—Abbot and bishop of Armagh different—Tribute to co-arb of Patrick extended—Spurious title-deeds of See of Armagh—A spurious canon—The Book of Armagh—The Book of the Angel—The abbot of Armagh prepared to acknowledge the claims of the Pope—Increasing superstitions in Ireland—The staff of Jesus—The arts cultivated in Ireland—Stone churches—Round towers—Irish use instrumental music in worship . . . . . *Page* 90—125

CHAPTER VI.

FROM THE FIRST ATTACK OF THE NORTHMEN ON IRELAND TO THE DEATH OF BRIAN BORUMHA, A.D. 795 TO A.D. 1014.

The Vikings—Black and White Strangers—Attacks on Rechrann, Iona, Inishmurry, Bangor, and Armagh—Turgesius reigns over Northern Ireland; his death—Dissensions of native Irish chiefs—Northmen find allies in discontented native dynasts—Black and White Strangers quarrel; battle of Carlingford—Dublin the capital of the Northmen—Learned Irishmen go abroad—Unfriendly reception of Irish clergy on the Continent—Canon of Council of Chalons—Canon of Council of Celcyth—No diocesan hierarchy in Ireland—Comparatively pure faith of Irish Church—Evidences of Irish piety—No image-worship in Ireland—Transubstantiation not acknowledged in Ireland—Sedulius and his commentaries—Sedulius ignores the supremacy of the Pope; opposed to image-worship and transubstantiation; his views as to justification and the marriage of the clergy; regards bishops and presbyters as originally the same—Dungal, the Irishman, settles at Pavia; opposes Claudius, bishop of Turin—Claudius of Turin and his views—Claudius not an Irishman, but probably instructed by an Irishman—Intellectual eminence of Irishmen in the ninth century; causes of this—Johannes Scotus; his genius, wit, and learning—His views relative to reprobation and transubstantiation—Mode of administration of the Eucharist in the ancient Church of Ireland—Old Eucharistic hymn—Incorrect modes of speech relative to the Eucharist—John Scotus, the Saxon monk—Patrick of Glastonbury—Many high-born Irishmen now ecclesiastics—Cormac Mac-Culinan; his character and remarkable career—Fighting clergy—Continued attacks of the Northmen—Malachy II. king of Ireland—Brian Borumha (or Boru), his early career; his vigorous and wise administration—Battle of Clontarf; Brian's religious exercises on that day—Worship of the Irish at this period—Gradual introduction of Latin—Increasing power of co-arb of Patrick—Disputes about the co-arbship—Influence of the Book of Armagh—Pilgrimages to Rome—Brian Boru makes a remarkable entry in the Book of Armagh . . . . . *Page* 126—157

CHAPTER VII.

FROM THE DEATH OF BRIAN BORUMHA TO THE CLOSE OF THE SYNOD OF RATHBREASAIL, A.D. 1014 TO A.D. 1110.

State of Ireland after the death of Brian Boru—Ireland has still some literary reputation—Marianus Scotus, Tighernach, and others—Pilgrimages to Rome—Conversion of the Northmen to Christianity—Bishops of Dublin, Waterford, and Limerick, their ecclesiastical position—Effect of Norman Conquest of England on Ireland—Letter from Gregory VII. to the Irish—Lanfranc, archbishop of Canterbury, and the Church of Ireland—Letters of Lanfranc

to the king of Dublin and to Turlogh O'Brien—Anselm of Canterbury and his correspondence with Ireland—Number of bishops still in Ireland—Malchus, bishop of Waterford—O'Haingly, bishop of Dublin—Gillebert, bishop of Limerick and his zeal for Romanism—King Murtogh O'Brien and his correspondence with Anselm of Canterbury—Murtogh favourable to ecclesiastical changes—Bestows the city of Cashel on the Church—Celsus of Armagh—Degeneracy of the co-arbs of Patrick—Visitations of the co-arbs of Patrick—Celsus consents to new arrangements—The Synod of Rathbreasail—Gillebert, the Pope's legate, presides; comparatively few bishops present—Murtogh O'Brien and the Synod—Diocesan episcopacy set up—Distribution of the dioceses—Synod of Usneagh—Old Irish bishops not chorepiscopi—Deterioration of the Irish Church—Increase of superstition—Conduct of the clergy when pestilence apprehended—Fasting of the clergy—Liberty of the Irish Church lost by the Synod of Rathbreasail . . . . . *Page* 158—184

BOOK II.

FROM THE SYNOD OF RATHBREASAIL TO THE DEATH OF HENRY VII. A.D. 1110 *TO* A.D. 1509.

CHAPTER I.

FROM THE SYNOD OF RATHBREASAIL TO THE CLOSE OF THE SYNOD OF CASHEL, A.D. 1110 TO A.D. 1172.

State of Ireland not improved by recent ecclesiastical legislation—Civil war—Destruction of churches and monasteries—Malachy O'Morgair and his biographer Bernard—Malachy son of a clergyman—Ivar O'Hegan and Malachy—Malachy ordained and acts as vicar for Celsus—Malachy afterwards instructed by Malchus at Lismore—His acquaintance with King Cormac Mac Carthy—Malachy becomes abbot of Bangor; becomes bishop of Connor—Bernard's account of Connor—Ritualism of Malachy—Irish marriages why condemned—Malachy's labours at Connor—Appointed archbishop of Armagh—Driven out of Ulster—Opposition of the family which had long enjoyed the co-arbship of Armagh—Malachy returns from Kerry to Ulster; makes a compromise and obtains the staff of Jesus; after some time resigns the primacy; becomes bishop of Down—Malachy sets out for Rome—Visits Clairvaux—His intercourse with the Pope—Appointed Papal legate—Directions relative to the Palls—Cistercian monks settled at Mellifont—Malachy's zeal—Malachy encounters an opponent of transubstantiation—Bernard's Life of Malachy not quite trustworthy—Malachy again sets out for Rome—His death at Clairvaux—His suspicious miracles—Cardinal Paparo now sent to Ireland—Synod of

Kells—Palls given to Armagh, Cashel, Dublin, and Tuam—Dissatisfaction of the northern clergy—Arrangements of the Synod of Kells—Irish annals give little information respecting important Irish Synods—Pope Adrian IV. authorizes Henry II. to invade Ireland—Genuineness of the Bull indisputable—What the Pope meant by the Irish nurseries of iniquity—A new privilege given to Armagh—Bull not immediately acted on—Synod held at Armagh when the first party of the invaders arrived—Its pusillanimous proceedings—Equivocal conduct of Irish bishops—Henry's proceedings in Ireland—Synod of Cashel—Its canons and their tendency—Great change in the Church of Ireland . . . . . *Page* 187—222

CHAPTER II.

FROM THE SYNOD OF CASHEL TO THE DEATH OF KING JOHN, A.D. 1172 TO A.D. 1216.

Bull of Adrian a public document—Irish prelates readily submit to Henry II.—Letters of Pope Alexander III. to the Irish princes, Henry II. and the Irish prelates—Brief of Alexander III. read in Synod of Waterford—Degradation of the Irish Church—Ireland imperfectly subdued—The Brehon law and the laws of England—Rapacity of the English adventurers—Death and character of Strongbow—William Fitz-Aldelm and John De Courcy—The legate Vivian at Downpatrick—Vivian holds a Synod at Dublin; his covetousness—Change in the constitution of the Irish Church—Laymen excluded from Synods—Bishops no longer appointed solely by clergy and people—Augustin made bishop of Waterford by the king—Irish prelates at the Third Council of Lateran—Laurence O'Toole, archbishop of Dublin; his history and character—His successor John Cumin—Advancement of Dublin and jealousy of Armagh—Synod of Dublin in A.D. 1186—Regulations relative to tithes—Celibacy of the clergy—Albin O'Mulloy and Giraldus Cambrensis in the Synod of Dublin—Canons relating to altars, fonts, and graveyards—Imperious character of Archbishop Cumin—His dispute with the Viceroy—The diocese of Dublin laid under an interdict—The English invasion and ecclesiastical architecture—Abbeys built by the invaders—Difference between the new and old monasteries—Jocelin and his Life of St. Patrick—Disputes created by a vacancy in the archbishopric of Armagh—Innocent III. and King John—Irish prelates at Fourth Lateran Council—Constitutions of a Synod at Trim in A.D. 1216—Suppression of small bishoprics—Bishoprics united with others—The bishopric of Glendalough—Christ Church, Dublin, and St. Patrick's—The Pope now at the height of his power—Altered position of Irish bishops—Prelates appointed to civil offices—Promotion of Englishmen in Church of Ireland—Degeneracy of the higher clergy—Disputes between bishop of Waterford and bishop of Lismore—Papal power advances rapidly in Church of Ireland . . . . . *Page* 223—252

CHAPTER III.

FROM THE DEATH OF KING JOHN TO THE DEATH OF KING EDWARD I., A.D. 1216 TO A.D. 1307.

Multiplication of religious edifices no proof of the growth of true godliness—The Dominicans, Franciscans, and other new orders appear in Ireland—Superstition and Papal influence promoted by these new orders—Tithes now generally paid—Secular dignity and power of the clergy—Exemption from civil jurisdiction—Oppression of the ecclesiastical courts—Case of the widow Margaret le Blunde—Collisions between civil and ecclesiastical courts—Usurpations of ecclesiastical courts—Excommunication and its effects—Dispute between the archbishop of Dublin and Fitz-Adam the keeper of the king's forests—Dispute between the citizens of Dublin and the clergy respecting ecclesiastical dues—The Pope supports the clergy—Church Defence Association established by the archbishop of Armagh—Abuse of Church patronage—Irishmen excluded from Church dignities—Englishmen and Italians promoted—Dissatisfaction of native Irish clergy—Steady growth of Papal influence—Four great Papal assessments in this century—The granting of Indulgences—History of Indulgences—Veneration of relics—Relics of St. Mochta—Relics of Patrick, Brigid, and Columbkille found at different times and in different places—Literary Irishmen, John of Holywood, Peter Hibernicus, Gotofrid, and Thomas Hibernicus—John Duns Scotus and the Immaculate Conception—Suppression of the Knights Templars by Clement V. . . . *Page* 253—272

CHAPTER IV.

FROM THE DEATH OF EDWARD I. TO THE DEPOSITION OF RICHARD II., A.D. 1307 TO A.D. 1399.

Unsatisfactory state of Ireland—British and Brehon law—Arrival of Edward Bruce; crowned King of Ireland—His defeat and death—His Irish adherents excommunicated by the Pope—Petition to the Pope from King Donald O'Neill and the Irish—Its melancholy statements—Heartless conduct of the Pope—English injustice continued—Prosecution of Dame Alice le Kyteler for heresy—Conduct of Ledred, bishop of Ossory—Le Poer, and the Irish Chancellor—Condemnation of Dame Alice and Petronilla—Sentence on William Outlaw—No proper account of the proceedings preserved—Career of Ledred, bishop of Ossory—Richard Fitzralph, archbishop of Armagh—His controversy with the Mendicants—His account of the Mendicants—His opinions condemned—His death, and reputation for sanctity—The English power continues to decline in Ireland—The degenerate English—Gossipred and Fosterage—Ill-advised proceedings of the English government—The Statute of Kilkenny and its provisions—Dispute between the archbishops of Armagh and Dublin—Coyne and Livery—Refusal of the bishops to submit to parliamentary taxation—Seditious conduct of Archbishop Kelly—Despotism of the clergy—Rapacious collection of tithes—St. Patrick's Purgatory, Lough Dearg—Wretched state of the population—English by birth and English by blood—Attempts made to provide a better education—Proposed colleges in Dublin and Drogheda. *Page* 273—300

CHAPTER V.

FROM THE DEPOSITION OF RICHARD II. TO THE DEATH OF HENRY VII., A.D. 1399 TO A.D. 1509.

Curtailment of the English Pale—Confusion created by the Wars of the Roses—Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck—The Pope supports Henry VII.—The English sustain themselves in Ireland by dividing the natives and pensioning some of them—Attendance in the Irish Parliament avoided—The Fitzgeralds and the Butlers—Poynings' Act—Jealousies of Irish and English clergy—Charges against Archbishop O'Hedian—The Annals of Ulster—The art of printing and the use of fire-arms—Irishmen at Roman jubilee in 1451—Pilgrimages, funerals, and wax-lights—Masses for the dead—Disputes and violence of the clergy—Military prelates—Incontinence of the clergy—Keating, prior of Kilmainham, his violence and sedition—Non-residence of the higher clergy—Avarice of the clergy—Extortion of the Court of Rome—Simony—Competition for appointments to benefices—Union of bishoprics—The bishopric of Enaghdune and the wardenship of Galway—Erection of convents—The Franciscan convent of Donegal—Disorders of Irish convents in 15th century—Mendicants almost the only preachers—How Ireland became so intensely popish—Artifices of the Pope to advance his influence—The method of Provisors—The Pope supports the king of England—Excommunication often employed—Owen O'Neill and the archbishop of Armagh—Disputes between the clergy and others—Irish Church represented in Council of Constance—Fall of Constantinople—Pestilence and famine in Ireland—Miserable state of the country . . . . . *Page* 301—326

BOOK III.

FROM THE DEATH OF HENRY VII. TO THE DEATH OF JAMES I. A.D. 1509 *TO* A.D. 1625.

CHAPTER I.

THE REIGN OF HENRY VIII., A.D. 1509 TO A.D. 1547.

State of Ireland in the beginning of Henry's reign—Weakness of the English Government—Proposal to subdue the country—Rebellious spirit of the native chieftains—Pope had no reason to fear for his dominion—Ignorance of the clergy and people—Immunities of churchmen—Henry not more licentious than contemporary popes and princes—His objections to his marriage with Catherine sustained by the best canonists—Ireland not so well prepared for the Reformation as England—Popularity of Henry in the beginning of his reign—The

Earl of Ossory agrees to resist the Pope—Irish churches generally in a ruinous state in the beginning of this reign—Suppression of the monasteries—George Browne, archbishop of Dublin—Commencement of the Reformation—Character and proceedings of Browne—Opposition of Cromer, archbishop of Armagh—The Irish Parliament declares the king head of the Church—Makes other arrangements relating to the Church—Continued suppression of monasteries—Use of English required throughout the Pale—A law made for the establishment of schools—The proctors oppose the Supremacy Bill—Injudicious movements of Archbishop Browne—Destruction of the Staff of Jesus and of the Image of the Virgin at Trim—Measures taken by the Pope—Continued opposition of Cromer—Paul III. excommunicates Henry—Letter from the bishop of Meath, or Metz, to O'Neill—Character of Con O'Neill—Folly of the Irish in now adhering to the Pope—O'Neill becomes the leader of the Northern Irish—Defeated at Ballahoe—Humiliation of the native chiefs—Submission of Desmond, O'Neill, and others—Submission of the hierarchy—The Irish Parliament declares Henry king of Ireland—Popularity of the measure—Appearance of the Jesuits in Ireland—Robert Waucop, Romish archbishop of Armagh—Continued suppression of the monasteries—Little done in this reign to advance the Reformation in Ireland—Translation of the Lord's Prayer and a few other formularies into English—No blood shed in Ireland for religion in the reign of Henry VIII.—Peaceful state of the island at the end of his reign. . . . . *Page* 329—354

CHAPTER II.

THE REIGNS OF EDWARD VI. AND MARY, A.D. 1547 TO A.D. 1558.

Causes of the slow progress of the Reformation in Ireland in the reign of Edward VI.—Activity of the Jesuits and the Papal party—Why the native chiefs adhered to the Pope—Want of evangelical preachers—The Reformation curtailed the fees of the clergy—Reforms now introduced without the authority of Parliament—New prelates favourable to Protestantism appointed—Dowdall of Armagh leaves the country—Goodacre appointed his successor—Bale, bishop of Ossory; his zeal and labours—Bale's difficulties and dangers—Peace of Ireland during the reign of Edward VI.—English Liturgy introduced—Great lukewarmness on the part of the authorities—Papal party vastly encouraged by the accession of Mary—Dowdall of Armagh returns—Married bishops and clergy deposed—Synod of Drogheda, and the preaching of the rectors and vicars—Hugh Curwin made archbishop of Dublin and Lord Chancellor—His peculiar position as a member of the Irish hierarchy—Other Roman Catholic prelates appointed—Popery fully re-established by Parliament—Act for the punishment of heretics—Reasons why no blood shed for religion in Ireland in reign of Mary—Confiscation of monastic property now continued—Ireland as disturbed in the reign of Mary as at any former period—The system of colonization first introduced into Ireland in the reign of Mary. *Page* 355—370

CHAPTER III.

FROM THE ACCESSION OF ELIZABETH TO THE DEATH OF SHANE O'NEILL, A.D. 1558 TO A.D. 1567.

Elizabeth soon proclaims her attachment to Protestantism—A strange scene in a Dublin cathedral—Curwin, archbishop of Dublin—Bibles in Ireland—The Irish Parliament of 1560—Act of Uniformity, and Oath of Supremacy—Remarkable clause in the Act of Uniformity—The bishops in the Parliament of 1560—Few of the bishops conformed—The Irish Episcopal Succession—Causes of dislike to Protestantism—Character of the bishops who remained Romanists—Irishmen still go to Rome in quest of bishoprics—The Jesuits in Ireland—David Wolf—Character of the Protestant hierarchy—Craike, Brady, and Loftus—Act of Uniformity could not be enforced, and Oath of Supremacy neglected—Articles of Religion for the Protestant Establishment—David Wolf, the Nuncio, and Shane O'Neill. . . . . Page 371—396

CHAPTER IV.

FROM THE DEATH OF SHANE O'NEILL TO THE DEATH OF THE EARL OF DESMOND, A.D. 1567 TO A.D. 1583.

Wretched state of Ireland at this period—Preaching of the friars unprofitable—Causes of the decay of the parish churches—Elizabeth excommunicated by Pius V.—Strange dilemma in which Romanists were placed by the Bull of Excommunication—The Bull induces some to rebel—Gregory XIII. explains the Bull of Pius V.—The Act of Uniformity seldom enforced—Acts of the Irish Parliament of 1569—Proposal to divide Ireland into counties and erect schools—Viceroy to administer Church patronage in south and west—Nicholas Walsh and John Kearney—The Liturgy translated into Irish—Arrangements for preaching in Irish—Irish types brought into the country—Walsh made bishop of Ossory. His labours and murder—A translation of the New Testament into Irish commenced—The effects of the Reformation in Ireland as compared with its effects elsewhere—Little interference in many places with the old Romish priesthood—Proposal to make soldiers bishops—Gross ignorance and incompetency of the clergy—State of the diocese of Meath—Unworthy bishops, Middleton, Sheyne, and others—Only four of the prelates could preach—Extraordinary career of Miler Magrath, archbishop of Cashel—His scheming; his pluralities; his use of *aqua vitæ*; his peculations—His return to Romanism, and his funeral—Causes of the discontent of the Irish chieftains and their adherents—Quarrels of the Earl of Ormond and the

Earl of Desmond—Disloyalty of Desmond—Rebellion of James Fitzmaurice—Fitzmaurice subdued and pardoned—His proceedings in France, Spain, and Italy—The Bull of Gregory XIII. against Elizabeth, and in support of Fitzmaurice—Departure of Fitzmaurice and Sanders from Rome; arrival in Spain—The adventurer Stukeley; his death in Africa—Arrival of Fitzmaurice and Sanders in Ireland—Proclamation issued by Fitzmaurice—His death—Succeeded in the command by Sir John Desmond—Fresh Bull issued by Gregory XIII.—Defeat of the insurgents, and death of Allen—Rebellion of Desmond—Arrival of Italians and Spaniards at Smerwick—Cruel massacre—Death of Sir James Desmond, of Sir John Desmond, and of the legate Sanders—Capture and death of the Earl of Desmond—Desolation of the south of Ireland—Its spiritual condition. . . . . *Page* 397—428

CHAPTER V.

FROM THE DEATH OF THE EARL OF DESMOND TO THE DEATH OF QUEEN ELIZABETH, A.D. 1583 TO A.D. 1603.

Early Protestants persecuted in Scotland, England, Holland, France, and elsewhere—The Inquisition and the *Autos da Fé*—No such persecutions of the Irish Roman Catholics—Absurd statements of Roman Catholic writers on this subject—The calamities connected with the Desmond rebellion not a persecution of Irishmen for their religion—O'Sullivan reports persecutions which never occurred—O'Daly and others appeal to a persecuting Act of Parliament which was never in the Irish Statute Book—History of Dominic O'Daly—Two parties among Irish Roman Catholics—The disloyal bishops, Jesuits, and friars—Bishop Patrick O'Hely a reputed martyr—Creagh, Roman Catholic archbishop of Armagh—Dermot O'Hurley, archbishop of Cashel, another reputed martyr—Improper treatment of O'Hurley by Archbishop Loftus—Loftus and other prelates, persecutors—Sir John Perrot's government in Ireland—Act of Uniformity not enforced in his time—Proposal to found a University in Dublin—Proceedings of Archbishop Loftus respecting it—The Corporation of Dublin grants a site for the college—Original charter of the University—Collection of funds; contributions from all classes and from all parts of the country—Rapid progress of the building—Walter Travers, the first regular provost—His character, and his controversies with Richard Hooker—Travers succeeded as provost by Alvey—Roman Catholic seminaries established at Salamanca, Alcala, Lisbon, Douay, and elsewhere—Hugh O'Neill, Earl of Tyrone, and his rebellion—His military genius and success—The Bull of Clement VIII. in his favour—Arrival of Spaniards at Kinsale—Triumph of Lord Mountjoy—Policy of Elizabeth towards Roman Catholics—O'Neill's demand of liberty of conscience—Lord Barry and other Roman Catholics refuse to join O'Neill—Real character of O'Neill—He proposes to extirpate heresy—

The Spaniards propose to do the same—Papists and Loyalists—Eugene McEgan, the Vicar Apostolic—His cruelties and death—Roman Catholics constitute a large part of the army of Elizabeth in her wars against O'Neill—Slow progress of Trinity College, Dublin—Low state of religion in Ireland—Act of Supremacy enforced more strictly towards the end of Elizabeth's reign—Indifferent character of Protestant bishops and clergy—Spenser's account of them—Character of Romish clergy—Little progress made by the Reformation in reign of Elizabeth. . . . . *Page* 429—469

CHAPTER VI.

THE REIGN OF JAMES I., A.D. 1603 TO A.D. 1625.

James at first a favourite with the Romanists—Their seditious proceedings—Act of Oblivion and Indemnity—Inefficiency of Protestant ministry and zeal of the priests—Character of the Papal clergy—Proclamation for their banishment; its illegality—The Mandates; their illegality—Many cities and towns refuse obedience—Recusants fined and imprisoned—Government cannot carry out its policy—Improved circumstances of the country—Flight of the Earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnel, and confiscation of their estates—The plantation of Ulster and its arrangements—The plantation prospered—The plantation a blessing to all the lower classes of Irishmen in Ulster—Miserable state of Irish husbandmen in former times—Conditions of the plantation not fully carried out—The tenant-right of Ulster—The Protestant Church and the plantation—Montgomery, Protestant bishop of Derry, Clogher, and Raphoe—Andrew Knox of Raphoe; Dundas and Echlin of Down and Connor—Scottish ministers settle in Ulster; do not conform to prelacy or the Book of Common Prayer—The Parliament of 1613; its composition—The Convocation of 1615—James Ussher, his early career, and his controversy with Fitz-Symonds—The Protestant Confession of Faith—Presbyterian ministers in Ulster—Edward Brice, Robert Cunningham, and Robert Blair—Presbyterians in Down and Connor rapidly increase—Zeal of the Romanists—The Church Papists—Papal Bulls against the Oath of Allegiance prepared by James—Real ground of objection by the Pope to the Oath of Allegiance—Robert Lalor, the Romish Vicar General—Improvement in the general character of the Romish clergy—Romish Synod at Drogheda in 1614—Romish Synod at Kilkenny the same year—Complaints against Sir Arthur Chichester and Bishop Knox; absurd exaggerations—Sir Oliver St. John, and his Proclamation for the banishment of the Papal clergy—Groundless reports of persecution—Lord Falkland, and Ussher's sermon—Archbishop Hampton—Ussher's "Religion anciently professed by the Irish and British"—Proclamation in 1623 against the Papal clergy disregarded—Irish misgovernment towards the end of the reign of James—The Protestant hierarchy and clergy—Wretched state of the Established Church—Dublin

College and the Romanists—Peter Lombard, Florence Conry, O'Sullivan, and Keating—Dublin College a blessing to the country—Foundation of its Library —Improved position of Irish Protestantism . . . . . *Page* 470—514

APPENDIX A.—Articles of the Irish Protestant Church, drawn up in 1567. See p. 395, *note* (3) . . . . . *Page* 515—520

,, B.—Irish Roman Catholic Prelates in 1606. See p. 477—8, *note* (8) . . . . . *Page* 521—522

,, C.—Confession of Faith of the Irish Protestant Church, drawn up in 1615. See p. 494, *note* (1). . . . . *Page* 523—540

BOOK I.

FROM THE INTRODUCTION OF CHRISTIANITY INTO IRELAND TO THE SYNOD OF RATHBREASAIL.

A.D. 1110.

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY OF IRELAND.

CHAPTER I.

THE EARLY HISTORY OF IRELAND AND ITS APOSTLE PATRICK.

THE early history of Ireland, like that of most other countries, is buried in obscurity. As its mountain ridges are visible from the opposite coasts, it is probable that its first colonists passed over to it from England and Scotland. But all accounts concur in representing the ancient Hibernians as a mixed population. Those who maintain that a portion of them were the descendants of emigrants from Phœnicia can support the statement by a variety of very plausible arguments. Some of the settlers came from Spain; some, perhaps, from Gaul; and some, it may be, from Scandinavia.

There is satisfactory evidence that Ireland was known to the Greeks and Romans long before the birth of Christ.[1] In the first century of our era its harbours were frequented by traders from distant shores.[2] From a remote antiquity its inhabitants seem to have been distinguished by their attention to religious observances; as, even prior to the introduction of the Gospel among them, it was designated "The Sacred

[1] See the authorities quoted by Hales in his *Essay on the Origin and Purity of the Primitive Church of the British Isles*, Appendix 3—4. London, 1819.

[2] Tacitus, *Life of Agricola*, xxiv.

Island."[1] It has often been affirmed that the Pagan Irish were unacquainted with the elements of literature; but the accuracy of this assertion may well be questioned; and, if the Druids of Gaul and Britain could commit their thoughts to writing,[2] we may fairly presume that the religious guides of the people of the Western Isle were not altogether ignorant of the use of letters.

Shortly after the settlement of the Romans in England, Hibernian malcontents began to solicit their assistance. About A.D. 82, a petty Irish King, who had been driven from his throne, attracts our notice as a petitioner for their intervention. Nor was his application disregarded. Agricola—the Roman general, who at this time so greatly signalised himself by a a career of successful aggression in Britain—listened to the complaint of the royal suppliant, and afforded him protection.[3] The refugee supplied the victorious commander with important information relating to his native country: its subjugation was regarded as an affair of no great difficulty; and, for a time, the addition of the Emerald Isle to the Empire of the West appears to have been seriously contemplated. "I have often heard Agricola declare," says Tacitus, his son-in-law, "that a single legion, with a moderate band of auxiliaries, would be sufficient to complete the conquest of Ireland." The progress of the Roman arms in Britain created much anxiety across the channel; and the Irish warriors made various preparations for meeting an expected invasion.[4] But as the Romans never

[1] Hales, Appendix 5, 24. See also Phelan's *Remains*, ii. 61—62

[2] "Neque fas esse existimant ea literis mandare, cum in reliquis fere omnibus, publicis privatisque rationibus, Graecis utantur literis."—Cæsar, *De Bello Gallico*, lib. vi. c. 14. It is highly probable that the *Ogham*, a species of writing consisting of lines variously combined and of various lengths and inclinations, was known in Ireland before the Christian era.

[3] Tacitus, *Life of Agricola*, xxiv.

[4] In the *Annals of the Four Masters*, A.D. 240, we read of "the fleet of Cormac," the chief monarch of Ireland; and at the same time flourished the famous Finn Mac Cumhail, and his Irish militia. He was the father of Oisin or Ossian. Finn's soldiers were called Phenians or Fenians. This militia, as Pinkerton has observed, "seems to have been a rude imitation of the Roman legions in Britain. The idea shows prudence . . . for such a force alone could have coped with the Romans, had they invaded Ireland."—*Enquiry into Scottish History*, ii. 77.

succeeded in establishing their authority in Caledonia, they never attempted the reduction of Ireland.

During the fourth century natives of the Western Isle were often found in the Roman territory; for the Scots, who then joined the Picts in their raids into England, were unquestionably Irishmen. Hibernia was at that time called also *Scotia* or Scotland—a name which it retained for many centuries afterwards.[1] The light of the Gospel had long before reached South Britain; and there are intimations that it had already dawned on Ireland. Shortly after the middle of the third century, according to the ancient annalists, Cormac, the chief monarch of the kingdom, provoked the wrath of the Druids because he turned from them "to the adoration of God"[2]—a statement which apparently implies that he had renounced the rites of paganism, and had, at least to some extent, adopted a purer theology. This prince was by far the most accomplished of the kings of heathen Ireland; and though his religious convictions may have been cherished by very few of his subjects, it is scarcely probable that his testimony in opposition to current errors was wholly uninfluential.

In the fourth century Christianity was recognised by the State in South Britain, and professed by the mass of the population. British Bishops were to be seen sitting in Councils assembled in Gaul and Italy. There was meanwhile much intercourse between England and Hibernia; and it is very unlikely that Irishmen remained all this time ignorant of a religious system which had produced such changes throughout the West of Europe, and which had been adopted by their immediate neighbours as the national faith. Nor are there wanting evidences that the Gospel had already some adherents among themselves. Coelestius—a prime mover in one of

---

[1] North Britain was not called Scotia, or Scotland, until an advanced period of the Middle Ages. It was then called Scotia Minor, to distinguish it from Ireland, which was Scotia Major.

[2] *Annals of the Four Masters*, A.D. 266. Cormac is said to have erected the first water-mill for the grinding of corn introduced into Ireland. He was the grandson of a famous Irish monarch, known as Conn of the Hundred Battles. See a remarkable passage relating to Cormac in Todd's *St. Patrick*, p. 197, *note*.

the great controversies of the Church, and so well known as the companion of Pelagius—was a monk and an Irishman.[1] It is reported that, when abroad, he wrote letters to his parents in Hibernia;[2] and we may legitimately conclude that education had made some progress in the country, and that there were parties at home competent to read the correspondence.

Prosper, a Frenchman who flourished in the fifth century, informs us in his Chronicon that, in A.D. 431, "Palladius, being ordained by Pope Celestine, is sent to the Irish believing in Christ as their first bishop." This short sentence is one of the very few passages pertaining to the ecclesiastical history of Hibernia to be found in any Christian writer who lived on the continent of Europe, and who flourished within six hundred years after the birth of our Lord. But it is a pregnant announcement: and we may fairly infer from it, not only that there were believers already in the country, but also that they had in some way attracted the attention of the chief pastor of the metropolis of Western Christendom. Nor is it difficult to discover the channel through which Celestine obtained his knowledge of these Irish converts. In A.D. 429 two French bishops visited England for the purpose of assisting its orthodox clergy to suppress the Pelagian heresy; and whilst these strangers remained in South Britain, they had probably heard of a most hopeful religious movement going forward in the neighbouring island. There was then a constant correspondence kept up between Italy and Gaul; and, shortly after their return home, the good news from Hibernia must have reached the ears of the Roman Pontiff. Palladius, the agent selected by Celestine to set up a hierarchy in Ireland, was a deacon of the Roman Church; and if, as some assert, he was also a Briton by birth,[3] we can the better understand why he consented to leave the ecclesiastical capital of Italy, and engage in this distant enterprise. The prospect of the highest spiritual dignity in a kingdom within sight of

[1] Jerome describes him as "Scoticae gentis de Britanorum vicinia." Prol. ad. L. 3, *Comment in Jeremiam.*

[2] Gennadius, c. 44.

[3] See Lanigan's *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland*, i. 38. Dublin, 1829.

his native shores stimulated his ambition: and the mission, if successfully conducted, promised as much glory to the Pope as to Palladius. The new bishop is reported to have left Rome for Ireland accompanied by a number of clerical assistants, and bearing with him several copies of the Old and New Testament, as well as a goodly stock of relics.[1]

Prosper—whose testimony has been already quoted, and who supplies the earliest information respecting the designation of Palladius—was a keen controversialist, bent on the extinction of semi-Pelagianism. Aware of the influence of the name of the Roman Pontiff in the Western Church, he earnestly sought to accomplish his object by securing the countenance and co-operation of the great Patriarch. But Sixtus III., who occupied the Papal chair from A.D. 432 to A.D. 440, was unwilling to pronounce judgment on the new heresy: and Prosper endeavoured to quicken his zeal by exaggerating the merits of his predecessor, the orthodox Celestine. The two French bishops who had gone into Britain to combat Pelagianism, had appeared there by invitation from the native clergy, and had been deputed to the service by a native council.[2] Celestine may have been apprised of their intended journey, and may have encouraged them to undertake it: but Prosper gives him the entire credit of the deliverance of England from the spiritual leprosy.[3] He draws still more largely on his fancy when referring to the mission of Palladius. He could meanwhile have heard little of the proceedings of this bishop ordained for Ireland, save that he had landed there and entered on the work prescribed to him—but, writing about eighteen months[4] after his departure, and

[1] Lanigan, i. 38.

[2] Bede. i. 17; Stillingfleet, *Orig. Britannicae*, p. 192.

[3] He states that Celestine was induced to turn his attention to the state of Britain by his deacon Palladius. In the same style of adulation he ascribes to Celestine the deliverance of the Eastern Church from the Nestorian heresy, though he had very little to do with the matter.

[4] According to Migne, the work *Contra Collatorem* was written about A.D. 432, the very year in which, according to many accounts, Patrick set out from Rome. See Migne's *Patrol. Curs.*, tom. li. p. 215, *note;* and Lanigan, i. p. 195. It was evidently written very shortly after the death of Celestine, as it speaks of Sixtus as "nunc pontificem," xxi. 3.

assuming that he had achieved a series of spiritual victories, he tells us how he had "made the barbarous island Christian."[1] Little did he dream of the disaster which had befallen the emissary of Celestine. Palladius, with his attendants, reached his destination in safety; but, according to all accounts, he obtained so little encouragement that he soon relinquished the enterprise. Overwhelmed with disappointment, he embarked for North Britain, where, not long afterwards, he died of fever in what is now known as Kincardineshire.[2]

According to statements long received with implicit faith, when Celestine heard of the sad result of the mission of Palladius, he ordained Patrick and sent him to make another effort for the conversion of Ireland. This second papal agent, was, it is said, completely successful. But Prosper—who was well acquainted with what was passing in Rome, and who wrote shortly after the death of Celestine,[3]—knew nothing of Patrick's designation. Profoundly ignorant of the misfortunes of the first Romish missionary, he speaks as if success had crowned his exertions. And, for nearly two centuries after this date, no notice is taken of Ireland, either by the Pope or any of his officials. From A.D. 440 to A.D. 461, Leo I. a man of first-rate ability, was bishop of Rome; his watchful eye ranged over the whole Church, and upwards of one hundred and forty of his letters to correspondents in all parts of Christendom are still preserved: but not one of them relates to Hibernia. He was apparently totally unacquainted with a most prosperous mission, said to have been recently established there by one of his predecessors, with whom he had himself, at the very time of its supposed equipment, been on terms of the most confidential intercourse.[4] It is acknowledged that, for one hundred and fifty years after the death of Leo, the Church of Ireland continued to be in a very flourishing condition; and yet there is not a shadow of evidence that

[1] *Contra Collatorem*, xxi. 2. See also Lanigan, i. 38, 39, 43.

[2] See Lanigan, i. 39, 44.

[3] See above p. 7, *note* 4.

[4] Leo was Celestine's archdeacon, and was thus one of his most important functionaries. See Dupin's *Ecclesiastical Writers*, art. "Leo."

meanwhile any Bishop of Rome addressed to any of its ministers so much as a single line of advice, warning, or commendation.[1] If, all this time, it was in close communion with the chief pastor of the ecclesiastical metropolis of Italy, how are we to account for this strange reticence? Such a case has no parallel in the annals of the Church, and is susceptible of explanation according to no hypothesis which can be reasonably proposed. But, when the facts are more correctly exhibited, all the difficulties disappear.

According to the testimony of Prosper himself, there was a church in Ireland prior to the appointment of Palladius; for the Romish missionary was sent to the Hibernians, "believing in Christ." It would seem that the progress of the Gospel in the country had created quite a sensation in the West of Europe; and, in the best and oldest Irish manuscript relating to the ecclesiastical history of the island at present in existence,[2] it is recorded that "*Palladius* was sent by Pope Celestine with a gospel *for Patrick*, to preach it to the Irish."[3] This memorial reveals a state of things quite opposed to later traditions. It suggests that the representative of the Pope was seeking to enter into another man's labours, and to reap the fruits of a field which a more skilful workman had already cultivated. Christianity had ere this taken root in the island; and Celestine sent Palladius to found a hierarchy devoted to the papal interest. The stranger sought to conciliate the real Irish missionary by a present of a copy of the Gospels—a gift in those days of no little value. But the attempt proved a signal failure: and Palladius, after a short residence in Ireland, was obliged to take his departure. The testimony of Patrick himself throws much light on this obscure passage of Irish history.

[1] It is now admitted that even the letters of Gregory I. in Ussher's *Sylloge*, written about the close of the sixth or beginning of the seventh century, were addressed, not to Ireland, but to the East. See Lanigan, ii. 292, 3, and *Cambrensis Eversus*, ii. 741.

[2] The *Leabhar Breac*. See O'Curry's *Lectures on the MS. Materials of Ancient Irish History*, pp. 352—353. An edition of the *Leabhar Breac* has just been published in 2 vols. Dublin, 1874, 1875.

[3] See Dr. Petrie "On Tara Hill" in *Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy*, xviii. part ii. 98, 103.

There is still extant a piece of autobiography, under the title of his "Confession," which bears all the marks of an authentic document, and which is accepted as genuine by critics of all denominations. It was obviously written by the apostle of Ireland shortly before his death. We learn from it that he was born in Armoric Gaul—perhaps at Boulogne-sur-Mer[1]—and that clerical celibacy was not then enforced in the place of his nativity;[2] as his own immediate ancestors for two generations were churchmen. He was son of the deacon Calpornius, and grandson of the presbyter Potitus.[3] At the age of sixteen he was carried captive into Ireland, where he remained six years in bondage, employed as a herd boy. He had been a thoughtless youth; but in the day of adversity the lessons of divine truth began to make a saving impression on his heart, and he became a changed character. "I cannot," says he, "and indeed I ought not to be silent respecting the many blessings, and the large measure of grace, which the Lord vouchsafed to bestow on me in the land of my captivity. . . . I used to remain ever in the woods and on the mountain, and used to rise to prayer before daylight, in the midst of snow, and ice, and rain, and I felt no injury from it, nor was there any sloth in me."[4] He at length contrived to effect his escape, and returned to his native country; but the population of that part of Gaul remained in a very insecure and unsettled condition, and he was once more enslaved. His second captivity was, however, of brief duration. Some time afterwards he had a remarkable dream, of which, till death, he retained a vivid recollection, and which greatly influenced all his subsequent career. "I saw," said he, "in a vision of the night a man, whose name was Victoricius, coming, as if from Ireland,

[1] See Lanigan, i. 103, 137, 92—3. Lanigan has shown that the inhabitants of this district were called Britons from a very remote period, i. 105, 6. It appears that the Britons of Albion were originally colonists from the Britannia of the Continent, i. 107.

[2] For centuries after this period it was found impossible to enforce clerical celibacy in France. Gregory of Tours speaks of married bishops in his time. (*Hist. Francorum*, lib. x. 31. § 14.)

[3] *Confession*, i. 1.

[4] *Ibid.*, i. 2; ii. 6.

with innumerable letters, one of which he handed to me, and I read the beginning of the letter, which ran thus :—'The voice of the people of Ireland'—; and while I was reading aloud the beginning of the letter, I thought at that very moment I heard the voice of those who were near the wood of Foclud,[1] which is by the Western Sea, and they cried out thus—'We entreat thee, holy youth, to come and walk still among us.' And I was very much pricked to the heart, and could read no more, and so I awoke."[2] He regarded this dream as an intimation from heaven that he must become a missionary to Ireland; and, having been ordained a bishop, he set out for the country where he was to spend the rest of his days. His memory has been dishonoured by writers of the middle ages, who have ascribed to him a multitude of monkish miracles;[3] and so ridiculous are the achievements imputed to him, that some respectable authorities have been tempted to question his existence; but there can be no reasonable doubt that he

---

[1] This is said to have been in Tirawley, county Mayo. In this district Patrick's converts are reported to have been most numerous; as, according to tradition, he baptized there 12,000 persons, including the king and seven princes. See Lanigan, i. 252.

[2] *Confession*, iii. 10.

[3] One of the exploits imputed to him is the clearing of frogs out of Ireland. It appears that formerly there were none in the country. "Prior to 1696, they were utterly unknown in Ireland. That same year some spawn was brought over as an experiment by a Fellow of Trinity College; and about the same time, or perhaps a little later, Lady Moira is said to have brought some to her husband's estate in Ulster; and from these two centres all the Irish frogs have sprung."—*Annotations on Dr. D'Aubigné's Sketch of the Early Irish Church*, by M. Webb, p. 173. London, 1857. See also *Strictures on Plowden's Hist. Dissert.*, Part I, p. 18. *note*. London, 1804. Ware, in his *Archbishops of Armagh*, quotes from Donat, of Fesulae, near Florence, a passage in which it is stated that there were formerly no frogs in Ireland. See Harris's *Ware*, i. 15, 16. Giraldus Cambrensis mentions that the appearance of a frog at Waterford, before his time, greatly affrighted Donald, the king. "The king tore his hair in anguish, and said that it boded the invasion of the country."—*Girald. Camb.* I, Preface, xlii. It appears that the absence of various reptiles from Ireland can be explained on philosophical principles. "There are," says Sir Charles Lyell, "twice as many reptiles in Belgium as in England, and the number inhabiting England, is twice that found in Ireland. Yet the Irish species are all common to England, and all the English, to Belgium. It is, therefore, assumed that the migration of species *westward* having been the work of time, the Continent, England, and Ireland were meanwhile separated."—*Antiq. of Man*, p. 284.

preached the Gospel in Hibernia in the fifth century; that he was a most zealous and efficient evangelist; and that he is eminently entitled to the honourable designation of *The Apostle of Ireland.* He made no pretensions to the working of miracles, and he was obliged to prosecute his labours in the face of many discouragements. He encountered opposition from some of the petty princes, as well as from the Druids or Magi; and he was more than once thrown into prison. But his perseverance was indomitable, and his success extraordinary. "I am," says he, "greatly a debtor to God, who has bestowed His grace so largely upon me that multitudes should be born again to God through me; and that, of these, clergy should be everywhere ordained for a people lately coming to the faith. . . . The Irish, who never had the knowledge of God and worshipped only idols and unclean things, have lately become the people of the Lord, and are called the sons of God."[1]

In this *Confession* Patrick altogether ignores any mission from Celestine. He was firmly persuaded that he was called of God to the ministry in Ireland.[2] He never mentions either Rome or the Pope, or hints that he was in any way connected with the ecclesiastical capital of Italy. He recognises no other authority but that of the Word of God; and though he occasionally quotes Apocryphal Books,[3] he does so under

[1] *Confession*, iv. 16, 17.

[2] In the Hymn of Secundinus, this sentiment is again and again repeated. Thus the writer says:—

"Cujusque apostolatum a Deo sortitus est."

. . . . .

"Dominus illum elegit ut doceret barbaros."

. . . . .

"Quem Deus misit, ut Paulum ad Gentes, apostolum."

This hymn, said to have been written when Patrick was still living—though certainly not of so early a date—is unquestionably of very great antiquity. Like the "Confession," it completely ignores Patrick's mission from Rome. It is evidently not the production of an adherent of the Papacy. Thus the writer says:—

"Super quem (Patricium) aedificatur ut Petrum ecclesia,"

placing the Apostle of Ireland and the Apostle Peter in much the same ecclesiastical position. See the Hymn in Vallanueva, p. 307. Dublin, 1835.

[3] In the *Confession*, he quotes Tobias, Wisdom, and Ecclesiasticus as the Word of God. He never appeals to tradition, or the authority of the Church.

the mistaken idea that they formed part of the Canonical Scriptures. He is not free from a tinge of superstition, and he evidently shared the admiration of monasticism current in his times; and yet his "Confession" displays an amount of earnest and enlightened piety which contrasts most favourably with the starched ritualism of some of his contemporaries. He was a zealous Trinitarian, as well as a believer in the sovereignty of grace, in justification by faith, and in regeneration by the Spirit. "Jesus Christ," says he, "always existed . . . . begotten in an unspeakable manner before all beginning. . . . In Him we believe. We await His coming, Who, ere long, shall judge the quick and the dead. . . . He has poured out abundantly on us the gift of the Holy Spirit, even the earnest of immortality. . . . We confess and adore one God in the Trinity of the sacred name."[1]

There are good reasons for believing that Patrick died on the 17th of March, A.D. 465;[2] and if, according to the most ancient traditions, he laboured sixty years in Ireland,[3] he must have entered on his work here upwards of a quarter of a century before the arrival of Palladius.[4] If he came originally from a district in the North of France, we can readily explain why the worship and discipline he introduced into Hibernia differed so much from the ecclesiastical arrangements of Rome. For ages the claims of the Pope were resisted strenuously by many of the pastors of Gaul;[5] and the circumstances of

[1] *Confession*, i. 2.

[2] Lanigan, i. 355—363, has adduced a great variety of arguments in support of this date. See also *The Old Catholic Church*, p. 312.

[3] This is assigned as the length of his Irish ministry in the Hymn of Fiech, and other very ancient documents.

[4] See *The Old Catholic Church*, p. 311, where various testimonies are adduced to prove that Patrick came to Ireland in A.D. 405.

[5] Thus, about A.D. 445, we find the bishop of Arles setting at defiance the authority of Leo the Great. In the northern parts of the country, the bishops acted with still greater independence. See Gieseler, *Ecc. Hist.* i. 266, 7. The writer of the Preface to the recently published second volume of the *Senchus Mor* (p. xviii. Dublin, 1869), absurdly asserts that the authority of the Pope over the western parts of the Roman Empire, "was recognised at the Council of Nice, A.D. 325." The statement proves that the author is sadly deficient in knowledge of ecclesiastical history.

the times long enabled them to make good their opposition. The Empire of the West was tottering on the verge of dissolution, and in some places the executive authority was too weak to enforce the regulations of Councils. Thus it was that in certain districts papal pretensions were not recognised, village bishops were still to be found,[1] and metropolitans, properly so called, were unknown. "The Bretons," as a distinguished French writer has observed, "were not accustomed to attach archiepiscopal supremacy to the possession of any particular see. . . . Their religious hierarchy, vague and varying according to the popular will, was not rooted in the soil, or parcelled out by territorial divisions. . . . The ambitious pretensions of the prelate of Tours [who claimed authority over them] had therefore no validity in the eyes of the Bretons, who made no account of them; the Gallic bishop excommunicated them, but they still gave themselves no concern."[2] Patrick seems to have been connected in early life with some such locality; and hence it was that he established in Hibernia a church system of a somewhat primitive character. When Palladius arrived in the country, it was not to be expected that he would receive a very hearty welcome from the Irish Apostle. If he was sent by Celestine to the native Christians to be their primate or archbishop,[3] no wonder that stout-

[1] Thus Boulogne-sur-Mer, though called a village, is admitted by Lanigan to have been a bishopric. Lanigan, i. 96. We read of another bishopric (Hermon) in the same district, apparently of the same character. Lanigan, i. 166.

[2] Thierry's *Norman Conquest*, p. 9. London, 1841. In the African Church, the senior bishop, whoever he might be, was always the president. The Bishop of Rome insisted on a different arrangement. Pope Celestine, the same who sent Palladius into Ireland, in a letter to the bishops of Vienne and Narbonne, written A.D. 428, upbraids them for acting contrary to the discipline of the Church, and gives special directions that every province shall be governed by a metropolitan. See Migne, *Patrol. Curs.*, tom. l. pp. 429—35; Dupin, i. 424. Dublin 1723. Sismondi has remarked that even under the Romans, the race of Aremoric peasants maintained their independence better than the rest of the Gauls. *The French under the Merovingians*, p. 30.

[3] This is the proper meaning of "Primus Episcopus." See Bingham, i. 199. It is admitted by the highest authorities, that there were some bishops in Ireland before the time of Palladius. See the proof in *Trans. of the Royal Irish Academy*, xviii.; *Antiquities*, p. 47.

hearted Patrick refused to bow his neck to any such yoke of bondage.

The apology commonly assigned for the departure of Palladius from Ireland is obviously insufficient. It is alleged that a petty chief, named Nathi, opposed him, and that in consequence, he withdrew.[1] But Nathi's rule extended over a very limited territory—probably over only a portion of the present county of Wicklow—and why did not Palladius adventure a landing somewhere else on the northern or southern coast, instead of abruptly setting sail for Scotland? Why give up the whole mission in despair, because one chieftain, of no very considerable influence, exhibited hostility? Why not seek the support of those "Irish believing in Christ," to whom he had been directly commissioned? The dissatisfaction of Nathi cannot at all account for the strange procedure of the papal agent. Other causes must have obviously been at work. If Patrick, as there is every reason to believe,[2] was already in the island—if he had carried with him from Gaul a dislike to papal assumptions—and if, more especially, he was opposed to the pretensions of metropolitans—the difficulty is solved. Finding that the chief agent in the great religious revolution going forward in Ireland set his face against him, Palladius had no alternative but to retire and turn his attention to some other quarter where he might hope for better encouragement.

The lives of Patrick, which are extant, and which profess to give a detailed account of his missionary career in Ireland, cannot be relied on as authentic; and none of them appeared until hundreds of years after his death.[3] They may contain some grains of truth; but, as a whole, they are little better than a mass of fables and absurdities. Some of them were,

[1] See Lanigan, i. 39.

[2] See *The Old Catholic Church*, pp. 309—314.

[3] The earliest, that by Maccumachtheni in the Book of Armagh, was written about the end of the seventh century. Probus, whose Irish name was probably Coeneachair, and who is the author of one of the best and oldest of these Lives, is said to have died A.D. 950. Lanigan, i. 83. The *Life* by Jocelin is well known, and has often been reprinted. Its author, who was a Cistercian monk, lived in the twelfth century. Philip O'Sullivan published at Madrid, in 1629, a still more ridiculous *Life of Patrick*. See Harris's *Ware*, i. 4. Dublin, 1764.

perhaps, composed merely to entertain the reader with sensational tales of miracles and prodigies; and some were fabricated for the purpose of exalting the reputation of the See of Armagh.[1] Some of their writers were, in all likelihood, the dupes of their own credulity. These accounts endorse the story of Patrick's appointment by Celestine; but as they are quite unsupported by witnesses contemporary with the Irish evangelist, and as they are contradicted by a large amount of substantial evidence, they are entitled to no credit. Towards the end of the seventh century Patrick began to be confounded with Palladius.[2] It is not improbable that the acts of one or two individuals of the same name, who lived about the same period, have been ascribed to the distinguished missionary;[3] much purely legendary matter has been added to the narrative; and thus it has happened that the interweaving of various biographies and fictions has produced a web of hopeless perplexity. About the close of the seventh century little was known with certainty of the great Patrick.[4] At that time a Romanising spirit was beginning to prevail, especially in some of the monasteries of Ireland; and, as the learning of the age was confined chiefly to such establishments, it is not strange that the engrafting of a portion of the history of Palladius on the life of the great missionary was permitted to pass unchallenged. Whether done wilfully or in ignorance, it eventually promoted the interests of the Church of Rome. The people of Hibernia were the less disposed to object to papal jurisdiction, when told that their national apostle was sent to their country by the Italian pontiff.

That part of the history of Palladius has been tranferred to

---

1 Jocelin was patronised by Thomas O'Conor, Primate of Armagh; and Lanigan speaks of what is called the *Tripartite Life of Patrick*, as "a compilation apparently patched up at Armagh." Lanigan, i. 222—3.

2 See many proofs of this furnished by Dr. Petrie, in the *Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy*, xviii. Part II.

3 In the *Annals of the Four Masters*, A.D. 448, we read of "Patrick of the Prayers who had good Latin." This Patrick cannot be the author of the *Confession*. There was a Patrick connected with Ireland, who appears to have died in the Abbey of Glastonbury. He has been called Sen-Patrick. See O'Donovan's *Four Masters*, i. 143, *note*.

4 See Todd's *St. Patrick*, p. 402.

the biography of Patrick can scarcely admit of doubt. Patrick, for example, is described as the pupil, first of Martin of Tours, the father of French monachism, and then of Germanus of Auxerre, so well known by his discomfiture of the British Pelagians; but Martin died upwards of twenty years before Germanus became an ecclesiastical teacher,[1] so that a simple announcement of the chronology is sufficient to overthrow the credit of the narrative. It is, however, quite possible that Patrick may have obtained some instruction from Martin; and highly probable that Palladius studied under Germanus. In other instances Patrick and Palladius have obviously been confounded. Both are represented as sent from Rome at nearly the same period; both are described as commissioned by the same Pope Celestine; both are set forth as landing at the same harbour in Ireland; and of both it is stated that they were opposed by the same chieftain Nathi.[2] These coincidences are so striking and so numerous that an attempt was soon made to account for them by alleging that Patrick in his lifetime was also called Palladius.[3] But there is not a particle of evidence that the names were used interchangeably, until long after the arrival of the monk Augustine and his Romish fraternity in England, towards the close of the sixth century.[4] The story of the identity of Patrick and Palladius was subsequently turned to good account by Romanizers in Ireland; and contributed, no doubt, to prepare the way, in the Western Isle, for the recognition of the papal supremacy.

Though many of the tales relating to Patrick's missionary progress throughout Ireland must be discarded as apocryphal, there seems to be no reason to question the statement that he

---

[1] Martin died A.D. 397. See Murdock's *Mosheim*, i. 305. Germanus was an officer in the army, until the very day of his ordination in A.D. 418. See Todd's *St. Patrick*, p. 319.

[2] See *Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy*, xviii.; *Antiquities* p. 117.

[3] See Todd's *St. Patrick*, p. 305.

[4] It is quite evident that Patrick was different from Palladius. Had the two names really represented one person, the Roman party, during the controversy respecting Easter, would have mentioned the fact, and insisted, as a cogent argument, on the appointment of the Irish Apostle by Celestine. But they are silent on the subject; and they take care not to mention the mission of Palladius—for the very obvious reason that it was a failure.

once made a bold attempt to effect the conversion of Laoghaire, the chief monarch of the country. There is extant in the native language a hymn,[1] which he is said to have prepared for the occasion; and, though we may fairly hesitate to believe that he was employed at such a crisis in this literary exercise, it is certain that the memorial itself is a composition of extreme antiquity.[2] It is highly probable that it was suggested by some incident which occurred at the time; and that it is the work of a Christian poet present at the demonstration, whose spirit was deeply moved by its stirring recollections. We have satisfactory evidence that, in the seventh century, it was attributed to the Apostle of Ireland,[3] and that then a blessing was supposed to be attached to its repetition. Believing that in the attempt to gain a royal proselyte he must encounter all the devices of the powers of darkness, Patrick, according to the hymn, prepares for the contest by girding himself with the strength of Omnipotence. Thus he is represented as saying:—

"I bind to myself to-day
The Power of God to guide me,
The Might of God to uphold me,
The Wisdom of God to teach me,
The Eye of God to watch over me,
The Ear of God to hear me,
The Word of God to give me speech,
The Hand of God to protect me,
The Way of God to be before me,

[1] It may be found in Irish in the *Trans. of the Royal Irish Academy*, vol. xviii. *Antiquities*, pp. 57—67. The MS., from which it is taken, was reckoned 1,000 years old in the seventeenth century. *Ibid.* p. 56.

[2] Dr. Petrie describes it as "the oldest undoubted monument of the Irish language remaining."—*Ibid*, p. 55.

[3] It is ascribed to him in Tirechan's "Annotations on the Saint's Life," said to have been written in the seventh century, and preserved in the *Book of Armagh*, Petrie, p. 68. It seems to be referred to in the Hymn of Fiech—stanza 26—thus translated by Hales:—

"The hymn you chaunt, while living
Shall be a breastplate to each."

Hales, *Essays*, Appendix, p. 109. In the *Book of Armagh* there is a reference, as some think, to the Hymn of Secundinus, or Sechnall, as well as to the Hymn of Patrick, in these words:—

"III. His (Patrick's) Hymn should be sung for ever,
His *Irish* Psalm should be sung for ever."

Sir William Betham's *Antiq. Res.*, part ii. p. 388.

The Shield of God to shelter me,
The Host of God to defend me,
Against the snares of demons,
Against the temptations of vices,
Against the lusts of nature,
Against every man who meditates injury to me,
Whether far or near,
With few or with many.
I have set around me all these powers,
Against every hostile savage power,
Directed against my body and my soul,
Against the incantations of false prophets,
Against the black laws of heathenism,
Against the false laws of heresy,
Against the deceit of idolatry,
Against the spells of women, and smiths, and druids,
Against all knowledge which blinds the soul of man."[1]

This hymn exhibits the faith of the Primitive Church of Ireland. It embodies an acknowledgment of the great doctrines of the Gospel, including the Trinity, the Incarnation of Christ, the sovereignty of grace, the resurrection of the dead, and the general judgment. It reveals a dread of the magical influences attributed to "women, smiths, and druids"—but it is free from the grosser superstitions of later times. It endorses none of the peculiarities of Romanism; it makes no appeal to the virtue of sacramental symbols; it contains no invocations of Mary, the mother of our Lord; it speaks of no mediator save the "One Mediator between God and man—the Man Christ Jesus."

Nennius, who is supposed to have flourished in the ninth century, affirms that Patrick founded in Ireland three hundred and sixty-five churches, and "consecrated the same number of bishops."[3] Another earlier authority bears testimony to

[1] See Todd's *St. Patrick*, 427, 428, where the hymn is given at length.

[2] The Hymn of Secundinus, or Sechnall, to which reference has already been made, presents the same doctrinal characteristics. According to it, the divine oracles were Patrick's "catholic law."

"Testis Domini fidelis in lege catholicâ
Cujus verba sunt divinis condita oraculis."

[3] *History of the Britons*, c. 54. In the North all the early Irish churches were built of wood; in the South and West some of them were of more durable materials. They were generally small, seldom exceeding fifteen feet in breadth and thirty-six in length. See Stokes's *Life of Petrie*, p. 192. Petrie mentions one much smaller. *Ibid.* p. 287.

nearly the same effect. "The first order of Catholic saints," says this witness, "was in the time of Patrick, and then they were all bishops, famous, and holy, and full of the Holy Ghost, three hundred and fifty in number, founders of churches."[1] This number is largely increased by the Irish annalists. "By him," say the Annals of the Four Masters,[2] "many churches were erected throughout Ireland, seven hundred churches was their number. By him bishops, priests, and persons of every dignity were ordained—seven hundred bishops and three thousand priests were their number."[3] The writers who make these announcements may have been desirous to exalt the fame of Patrick; but, if they exaggerated the number of bishops ordained by him, they acted most absurdly; for, whilst they seriously imperilled their own credit as trustworthy witnesses, they could not hope by their statements to enhance his reputation. In the eighth or ninth century the multiplication of bishops was as much at variance with the existing ecclesiastical arrangements throughout Europe as it was opposed to the canons of various councils.[4] In the fifth century, or in the days of Patrick, Ireland did not probably contain more than from two to three hundred thousand inhabitants;[5] and seven hundred, or even three hundred and fifty diocesan bishops would obviously be a preposterously large supply for such a population. But the pastors ordained by Patrick were dignitaries of a very humble grade

[1] *Catalogue of the Saints of Ireland*, first published by Archbishop Ussher. It is supposed to have been written by some author who flourished not later than the middle of the eighth century. See Todd's *St. Patrick*, p. 88; and Reeves *Adamnan*, p. 334.

[2] O'Donovan's *Annals of the Four Masters*, ad an. 493. These annals are so called because compiled from ancient documents by four learned Irish monks who lived in the seventeenth century.

[3] The priests or presbyters here mentioned were ecclesiastics who assisted the bishop in his pastoral duties. Each Irish bishop, on an average, had from eight to nine presbyters. The deacon in the old Irish Church appears to have been a species of menial. See Reeves *Adamnan*, p. 104, *note* (c).

[4] See Council of Sardica, A.D. 343, canon 6; Council of Laodicea, about A.D. 360, canon 57, &c. &c.

[5] See Sir William Petty's *Political Anatomy*, chap. v. p. 317. The statement of O'Halloran that there were 100,000 fighting men in Ireland in the reign of Cormac in the third century, is evidently a monstrous absurdity. See Connellan's *Four Masters*, p. 267, note.

—they were such village or parochial bishops as were to be found in Britanny, the land of his birth—and the statement that bishops of this description could at one time have been reckoned by hundreds, rests on a sound historical basis. These Irish bishops were, in fact, simply *ordained preachers.*[1] According to the testimony of the witnesses already adduced, the number of bishops ordained by the apostle of Ireland corresponded exactly to the number of churches built; and we may thus see that each individual of the episcopal order had the use of only one meeting-house. Patrick proceeded on the principle that wherever a congregation could be collected, a bishop should be ordained. This arrangement was kept up in Hibernia for centuries. Seven churches were sometimes erected in the same locality, and each building had a bishop connected with itself. Aengus, the Culdee, writing in the ninth century, was able to enumerate no less than 141 places in the island in each of which there were, or had been, seven contemporary bishops.[2]

We may thus see how it happened that Patrick was so little noticed for centuries after he had so much signalized himself as the apostle of Ireland. The venerable Bede flourished in the eighth century; he was furnished with materials from the archives of Rome to guide him in his literary labours:[3] he appears to have possessed all the information they could supply relative to this country: and

[1] In the African Church in the fourth century, the Bishops were the only preachers. Augustine of Hippo, who commenced his ecclesiastical career towards the close of that century, is said to have been the first African presbyter who preached when a bishop was present. See Archbishop Potter on *Church Government*, p. 154. London 1839. Dr. Reeves virtually admits that the old Irish bishoprics were parochial—not diocesan. Thus he says: "The diocese of Down, *in its present extent*, is a collection of smaller sees, *which have been reduced to the condition of parishes*, and of districts which in primitive times were not assigned to any diocese. The same remark applies to Connor, and most of the larger dioceses of Ireland."—*Ecclesiastical Antiquities of Down, Connor and Dromore*, Appendix, p. 123.

[2] Todd's *St. Patrick*, pp. 32, 35. It appears that in St. Patrick's time ordinary ministers ordained. Thus in an old life (the Tripartite) we read that "Patrick had turned off to pray, and his people to baptize, *to confer orders*, and to propagate the faith." See Archbishop Colton's *Visitation by Reeves*, p. 122. See also the *Book of Armagh*, Betham, part ii. pp. 346, 367.

[3] Bede, Preface to his *Ecclesiastical History*.

yet, in his "Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation," though he repeatedly refers to Hibernia and its church, he never once names its great evangelist![1] Ireland never formed part of the Roman Empire, so that the canons of continental councils had no authority within its borders; these canons were but little regarded in Aremoric Gaul; and Patrick was freely permitted to transplant the ecclesiastical arrangements of the land of his birth to the land of his adoption. As the Irish apostle had no commission from Celestine, he was officially unknown to the Popes; and as his system of polity and worship differed widely from the Italian model, it is not strange that, though one of the most successful of ancient missionaries, his name was scarcely mentioned, for centuries after his death, by writers attached to the Church of Rome.

But whilst we have ample evidence that the polity and worship introduced by Patrick into Ireland were not transmitted from Rome, we are not to infer that his views were in all respects primitive and scriptural. At the commencement of the fifth century there was a considerable departure, all over the West, from the arrangements of the days of the apostles; and we are not to suppose that the great missionary planted in Hibernia a better form of Christianity than that in which he had been educated. He was born in the century in which the discipline of the cloister was first established: and as he grew up, monachism became amazingly popular. It is evident that he was infected with the prevailing mania for a life of celibacy; and thus it was that monks and nuns so early formed no small proportion of the population of the island. Nor was Patrick free from other delusions. In most parts of the church, the making of the sign of the cross—a gesture borrowed originally from heathenism[2]—was now

[1] He barely names Patrick in his Martyrology, but the authority of that work is somewhat doubtful. See Ledwich, p. 60. Dublin, 1803.

[2] See *Ancient Church*, p. 317. It is perhaps more than doubtful whether the earliest stone crosses found in Ireland are of Christian origin. The cinerary urns of Northern Italy, impressed with the sign of the cross, date a thousand years before the Christian era. See *Edinburgh Review* for January 1870, p. 238. A Maltese cross appears in the ruins of a Gallo-Roman villa near Pau, in the Basses-Pyrenees, accompanied by several other varieties, including the St. George's and

supposed to possess something like magic power; and it is not probable that Patrick rose superior to the current misconception. But the grosser forms of will-worship—since so prevalent in Ireland—were unknown in the days of its great apostle. Patrick was opposed to idolatry in every shape; and in his time no pictures or images were to be seen in the Hibernian churches. There was no invocation of Mary; neither were prayers presented to Paul, or Peter, or any other Saint. Neither did Patrick worship in an unknown tongue; for the memorable prayer which he is said to have addressed to God when he encountered the Druids at the court of Laoghaire, is in Irish. Neither was the rite of extreme unction administered in the Western Isle in the fifth century. And the doctrine of a Purgatory was not yet broached in the Church of Ireland; for Patrick believed that when a good man died, he "*rested*,"[1] or "*fell asleep in Christ*." The early Irish church unquestionably taught that the saints at death passed immediately into glory;[2] and yet, when an eminent disciple had completed his career on earth, the clergy were wont to introduce his name into their prayers in a way which implied that they sought a blessing on the faithful departed.[3] It would appear, however, that such only as were deemed the children of God in this world were thus remembered in posthumous supplications.

St. Andrew's, surrounding a colossal bust of Proteus. *Ibid.* p. 235. The earliest stone crosses of Ireland are adorned with heathen symbols, indicating their pagan origin. See Keane's *Towers and Temples of Ancient Ireland*, pp. 112, 126, 132, 133, 134. Dublin, 1867. See also *Proceedings and Papers of the Kilkenny and S. E. of Ireland Archæological Society*, vol. v., part ii., p. 385. New series, 1865.

[1] Thus the death of Benignus, one of the disciples of Patrick, is announced in the *Annals of Ulster* as "the rest of Bishop Benignus, the successor of Patrick." See O'Donovan's *Four Masters* i. 147, *note*.

[2] Thus Columbkille is represented as saying of a certain bishop, named Colman Mac Loigsech, that at death "his soul went up to heaven, beyond the sky and stars, borne by holy choirs of angels."—*Life by Adamnan*, iii. 12. Columbkille had a religious service the next day; but it evidently was not designed to pray for his repose, as he believed he was already in glory.

[3] "It appears from all the ancient liturgies under the names of St. Basil, Chrysostom, Gregory Nazianzen, and Cyril, that they prayed for *all saints, the Virgin Mary herself not excepted*."—BINGHAM'S *Antiquities*, book xv., ch. iii., § xvi See also Ussher's *Answer to a Jesuit*, chap. vii.

When Ireland embraced the gospel, Patrick, according to a current tradition, was permitted to modify the laws of the country, so as to bring them into harmony with the requirements of the new faith.[1] This story is destitute even of the semblance of probability. Laoghaire, who was the chief monarch of the island in the days of our apostle, never became a convert to Christianity ;[2] and some of his successors adhered to their pagan superstitions.[3] Under such circumstances it is obvious that the Irish missionary could not have dictated the arrangements of civil legislation. The Brehon law, which guided the decisions of the native Irish judges till the close of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, retained to the last some traces of its original barbarism. According to it, the murderer escaped by the payment of an *eric*, or fine ; and the property of a small landholder, at his death, was divided equally among all his male children, whether legitimate or illegitimate.[4] But, when the country threw off the yoke of paganism, there is no doubt that the church began at once to exercise a considerable amount of social influence. Its literature fell at length almost exclusively into the hands of the clergy; in a few centuries they had adopted views on various matters differing widely from those of their predecessors ; and documents, which they did not care to preserve, were either lost or forgotten. Thus it is that we now possess so very few genuine records, written by contemporaries, to illustrate our early ecclesiastical history.

[1] According to this story a general convention of kings, clergy, and bard-sages of Ireland was called "to rectify the national records." They appointed a committee of nine—among whom Patrick was the ruling spirit—to do the work. See O'Mahony's *Keating*, p. 411.

[2] See Lanigan, i. 371.

[3] O'Mahony's *Keating*, p. 433, note, and 434, note. New York, 1866. At this time Ireland was ruled by a number of petty princes, who were to a great extent independent, though acknowledging a species of allegiance to one chief monarch.

[4] See Ware's *Antiquities*, *Works*, p. 22. Dublin, 1705. This law as to the division of property is known as the law of *Gavelkind*.

CHAPTER II.

FROM THE DEATH OF PATRICK TO THE DEATH OF COLUMBKILLE. A.D. 465 TO A.D. 597.[1]

THE traditions as to the number of bishops in Hibernia in the time of Patrick have often created no little wonder; and it has been asked how, in a thinly peopled and barbarous island, so many educated men could have been so soon forthcoming? Much of the difficulty disappears when we remember that the labours of the great Irish missionary extended over threescore years, and that many of the preachers ordained by him had, in all likelihood, enjoyed but a small amount of literary training. In the circumstances of the country, high culture could not be expected. Piety and zeal, combined with gifts of utterance and a certain amount of Christian intelligence, were deemed sufficient qualifications for the episcopate; and the state of the neighbouring island suggests that Ireland was not now restricted to the services of native pastors. Not long after the time of Patrick there may not have been much difficulty in providing a large extemporaneous supply of educated ministers. About A.D. 449 the Pagan Saxons commenced to invade England; and many of the British clergy, driven from their own land, were forced to seek an asylum elsewhere. Not a few of them appear to have fled across St. George's Channel; and these refugees contributed greatly to promote the progress of Christianity in Ireland in the fifth and sixth centuries.[2]

---

[1] Columbkille died on the 9th of June, A.D. 597. See Reeves *Adamnan*, Appendix to Preface, p. 78. Additional Notes, pp. 309, 10.

[2] Various ecclesiastics distinguished at this time in Ireland were Britons by

The Saxons waged a war of extermination against the professors of the Gospel in South Britain; and at length most of the Christians in the island were shut up in Wales. Gildas, a British author[1] who flourished in the sixth century, gives a most melancholy account of the state of religion in his generation, and dwells with special severity on the degeneracy of the clergy. His work attests, however, that there were some who mourned over abounding wickedness; and we learn from other sources of information, that Wales even then contained a considerable number of men of piety and learning. There was much intercourse between its Christian population and their Hibernian co-religionists; and the influence of the Welsh Church can soon be distinctly traced in Ireland; for the order of worship established throughout the country by Patrick was, in various places, superseded by new modes of celebration.[2]

In the early history of Irish Christianity the prevalence of monasticism prominently attracts our notice. Some statements relative to the number of ascetics in the island are probably exaggerated; but there can be no doubt that monks and nuns abounded, and that they were generally regarded with admiring veneration. Various circumstances contributed to promote the popularity of monastic institutions. Though the manner of life pursued in them was a strange caricature of the cheerful piety of the apostles and evangelists, they speedily secured multitudes of devotees. Monasteries

---

birth. See Lanigan, i. 419, 424, 335, 465, 467, 492; ii. 12, 13, 43, 44, 48. Petrie speaks of crowds of foreign ecclesiastics—Roman, Egyptian, French, British, and Saxon—who flocked into Ireland as a place of refuge in the fifth and sixth centuries. *Round Towers*, p. 137.

[1] According to some he was born in Ireland. See Hale's *Essays*, p. 207. See also *Rer. Hib. Scrip. Veteres*, tom. i. cxcviii.

[2] This appears from an old document already quoted—*Catalogue of the Saints of Ireland*. It says of the first order of Irish Saints—that is, of those of the age of Patrick and of the times immediately succeeding: "They had one Head—Christ—and one chief—Patrick. They observed *one mass*" (or form of worship). It is said of the second order, who flourished between A.D. 542 and A.D. 599:—"They celebrated *different* masses, and had different rules." See Todd's *St. Patrick*, p. 88. "They received a mass from Bishop David and Gillas (or Gildas) and Docus, the Britons (or Welshmen)." *Ibid.* p. 89, note. Some writers attach the highest authority to the statements in this old catalogue of Irish saints; but apparently without sufficient cause.

in the time of Patrick were still in the vigour of their youth: they had many of the attractions of novelty; they were strongly recommended by the most distinguished Christian pastors; and they had special charms for the enthusiastic and morose, as well as for the lovers of solitude. They were introduced into France by the famous Martin—who was made Bishop of Tours about the time that Patrick was born—and the future Missionary, in the days of his boyhood, had, no doubt, often heard them extolled in terms of the highest eulogy. If, as is alleged, Patrick himself had been one of Martin's disciples, it is not improbable that the Irish evangelist propagated monachism as well as preached Christianity. The system of superstition which prevailed in the country before it embraced the Gospel prepared the minds of the people for thinking favourably of the new institute. Prior to the Christian era monasticism flourished among the Buddhists of the East; it was also found among the Druids of the West; and there are good grounds for believing that there were brotherhoods as well as sisterhoods of celibates in Ireland when Patrick commenced his missionary labours. The history of the celebrated Brigid—the Mary of Hibernia—serves to illustrate the way in which the asceticism of the Church was engrafted on the pagan institute.

The lives of Brigid[1] which have reached our times are of little authority; and it is exceedingly difficult, through the clouds of legendary folly in which her character has been enveloped, to discover its genuine features. Her parents were persons of distinction; but she was an illegitimate child[2]; and we do not perhaps greatly err when we describe her as a

[1] Colgan has published six lives of Brigid in his *Triad. Thaumat.* That by Cogitosus, which is best known, was, perhaps, not written earlier than the ninth century. Lanigan, i. 379; O'Donovan's *Annals of the Four Masters*, i. 172.

[2] Macgeoghegan's *History of Ireland*, i. 157. Lanigan makes a very feeble attempt to disprove this fact, i. 378. He admits that it is distinctly stated in several of the old "Lives;" and he says it is incredible, because her parents were professing Christians! The fact is acknowledged by the highest authorities. See the *Books of Hymns of the Ancient Church of Ireland.* Fasc. i. 92. A considerable number of the old Irish saints were illegitimate. *Ibid.* It seems probable that children born under such circumstances were very frequently devoted to what was called a religious life. *Ibid.*

person of great energy, of very devout habits, of a strong will, and of a somewhat romantic temperament. She survived Patrick sixty years, and died A.D. 525—when she had reached the age of seventy. Towards the close of the fifth century,[1] she founded a famous nunnery at Kildare. Several other establishments, framed after the same model, and erected during her own time in various parts of Ireland, were subject to her jurisdiction.[2] Her reputation for sanctity spread far and wide; and her name is still associated with not a few places in Great Britain and Ireland.[3]

In more than one point, the great nunnery of Brigid reminds us of the religious system which had previously been established in the country. The Druids had a profound veneration for the oak; and Brigid built a house for herself and her female friends in the immediate vicinity of a large tree of that description.[4] Hence the place subsequently acquired the designation of *Kildare*, or *the Church of the Oak*. The Druidesses were associated in companies of nine, each of whom took a vow of perpetual virginity;[5] and such is reputed to have been the number of her sisterhood when Brigid commenced her career.[6] Many females soon joined her; but we

[1] Between A.D. 480 and A.D. 490. [2] Lanigan, i. 407, 450, 452.

[3] Such as *Kilbride*, that is, *the church of Brigid;* and *Knockbride—the hill of Brigid.*

[4] This great oak continued to be treated with signal respect, and its trunk existed in the twelfth century. Moore's *History of Ireland*, i. 257. An oak grove at Derry was religiously preserved for many ages after the time of Columbkille. *Ord. Survey of the Co. of Londonderry*, p. 24.

[5] Pomponius Mela, a writer of the first century of the Christian era, apparently speaking of the Druidesses, tells us of a place "situated in the British seas . . . . famous for the oracle of a Gaulish deity, whose priestesses, devoted to perpetual virginity, are said to be nine in number." Lib. iii. c. 81. Davies's *Mythology and Rites of the British Druids*, p. 168.

[6] Carew's *Ecc. Hist. of Ireland*, p. 238. Dublin, 1835. It is a singular fact that Brigid inherited the name of an old pagan divinity. Keane says: "Her name in Irish is sounded as if it were written 'Breedh,' and answers to Brida, the Scandinavian name for Venus. Among the Tuath-de-Danaans, Breedh was the goddess of poets and smiths."—*Towers and Temples of Ancient Ireland*, p. 60. Moore says: "In no place was she honoured with more devotion than in the Western Isles (of Scotland), where most of the churches were dedicated to her patronage. . . . The very names of these islands—Hebrides, as if *Ey Brides*—is said to mean the Isles of Brigid." See O'Mahony's *Keating*, 425, 426, note. New York, 1866.

may presume that her eight original coadjutors continued to enjoy a place of special honour in connection with the management of her institution. The Druidesses, like the Vestal Virgins of Rome, are said to have kept a sacred fire continually burning; and such a fire was preserved from age to age in the nunnery of Kildare. Giraldus Cambrensis tells us that in his time, or seven hundred years after the formation of the sisterhood, this fire was still unextinguished.[1]

Among the Druids there appear to have been communities of monks as well as of nuns; for Ammianus Marcellinus, who was contemporary with Patrick, describes them as "bound together in brotherhoods and corporations, according to the precepts of Pythagoras."[2] It is not strange, therefore, that monasticism made rapid progress in Ireland; for, to a certain extent, it was merely a revival of old superstitions. When patronised by men of extensive influence, it attracted crowds of converts. There was, however, one important feature which distinguished the monasteries of Ireland from many establishments of the same name to be found elsewhere. The senior monks, like the Druids, were the religious teachers of the people; their abbots were commonly men of superior erudition; and, at an early period, the places where the monks were congregated attained celebrity as seminaries of learning. Irishmen still speak with enthusiasm of the fame of these ancient institutes; and tell how Benignus presided at Armagh, how

[1] As to the worship of the sun, under the emblem of fire, by the Magi or Druids of Britain, see Davies's *Mythology*, &c." p. 154, 295, 533. Henri, Archbishop of Dublin, early in the thirteenth century, extinguished Brigid's fire. It is said to have been surrounded by a circular osier hedge, male intruders within which were believed to incur supernatural punishment from the "veiled virgin of the Curragh." Gilbert's *Viceroys of Ireland*, p. 87. Dublin, 1865. The fire extinguished by Henri was relighted, and continued to burn till the total suppression of monasteries at the Reformation. Archdall's *Monasticon*, p. 329.

[2] Book xv. 9. See also Davies, p. 525. Pythagoras strongly recommended silence and seclusion from the world. Various superstitions, not yet extinguished in Ireland, appear to have come down from the times of the Druids. In certain ceremonies they made use of the yew tree, of the quicken, or rowan tree, and of the blackthorn. O'Curry's *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Irish* ii. 227. "I have myself," says O'Curry, "known some housewives in Munster who would not have had a churn for their dairies without at least one roan-tree hoop on it." *Ibid.* ii. 216.

Finnian founded a school at Clonard in Meath, how Mochay taught at Nedrum,[1] how Brendan gave instructions at Clonfert, how Kieran erected a great monastery at Clonmacnois, and how others elsewhere signalized themselves by similar achievements.[2] Among the most renowned of these seats of learning was that at Bangor in County Down, of which Comghall was the founder. Comghall is said to have been a native of Magheramorne, near Larne;[3] multitudes of youths flocked to him for instruction; and among the alumni of his establishment, was one who afterwards acquired a European reputation —the zealous and erudite Columbanus.

By far the most illustrious of the Irish churchmen of the sixth century was an individual of the same name as this disciple of Comghall. Both were called Columba or *Dove*; but, to distinguish them, posterity have agreed to speak of the one as *Columbanus*, and of the other as *Columbkille*. The latter, who was considerably older than his namesake,[4] was born at Gartan, in the county of Donegal, in A.D. 521.[5] As he grew up he exhibited various qualities, as well of body as of mind, fitted to excite the admiration of his countrymen. He was of lofty stature; he had a clear and commanding voice;

---

[1] Lanigan understands by this Antrim. *Eccl. Hist.* i. 403. It is more properly Mahee Island in the County of Down. See Reeves, *Antiquities of Down, Connor and Dromore*, p. 10.

[2] The famous school of Lismore does not appear to have been established till the seventh century. See Lanigan, ii. 353. The name of Ailbe is connected with Emly, and the name of Declan with Ardmore; but the greatest obscurity hangs over their history. See Lanigan, i. 22, 283.

[3] In Co. Antrim, Reeves, *Eccl. Antiq.* p. 152. He was born A.D. 517 and died A.D. 602. Bangor was founded A.D. 558. *Ulster Journal of Archæology*, i. 173.

[4] Columbanus was born about A.D. 559, according to some. Lanigan is disposed to place his birth rather earlier. *Eccl. Hist.* ii. 263.

[5] Reeves, *Adamnan*, Appendix to Preface, lxix. and *note* (m). The most ancient Life of Columbkille, that of Cummene, one of his early successors in Iona, is embodied in that of Adamnan, another of his successors, who became abbot in A.D. 679. Adamnan's Life has been illustrated with great industry and learning by Dr. Reeves. Adamnan died in A.D. 704, in the 78th year of his age. Reeves, Appendix to Preface, xli. liii. lvi. Lanigan conjectures (*Ecc. Hist.* iii. 141) that Adamnan is the same as Maccathenus or Maccumachtheni who wrote the "Life of Patrick," to be found in the *Book of Armagh*. See before p. 15, *note* 3.

and a noble bearing. He could express himself with ease and gracefulness; he had a quick perception and a sound judgment; he was an ardent student; and he had great powers of application. His temper was hot, and he sometimes gave way to gusts of passion; but, withal, he was just and generous, and his indignation was never so much excited as by the perversity of the wicked.

In the early Irish Church many of the clergy were either chieftains themselves or nearly allied to families of distinction. It was partly owing to this cause that Christianity made such rapid progress in the country; for not a few of those admitted into the ministry possessed great social influence. Columbkille enjoyed the advantages of exalted birth; as by both his parents he was of royal lineage. These honourable antecedents, added to his personal endowments, soon placed him in the position of a leader; and more than once he was able to control the political movements of the Irish princes.

When only twenty-five years of age Columbkille is said to have built a church at Derry—a place, upwards of eleven hundred years afterwards, famous for its great siege—and subsequently he is reported to have founded at Durrow, in King's County, the most important of his Irish monastic establishments.[1] Some very grave incidents of his life are involved in much obscurity. He delighted in the acquisition of books; he spent no small portion of his time in transcribing manuscripts; and, on one occasion, he copied with great care a psalter or gospel, lent to him by Finnian of Moville.[2] Columbkille conceived that the transcript was his own property—more especially as he had in no way injured the original; but Finnian disputed the claim, and the matter was deemed of so much consequence that it was at length referred to the decision of Diarmaid, King of Ireland. The arbiter delivered the very homely award that "as the calf must go

[1] Bede, iii. 4; Reeves, *Adamnan*, *note* (b).

[2] Reeves, *Adamnan*, p. 103, *Moville*, i.e. *the plain of the sacred tree*. The church formerly stood near the head of Strangford Lough, not far from Newtonards. Reeves, *Eccl. Antiq.* pp. 78, 851. This Finnian, who is to be distinguished from Finnian of Clonard, is said to have been an Irish bishop.

with the cow, so the copy must belong to the book."[1] The transcriber was exceedingly dissatisfied with this decision; and another act of the Sovereign created still greater exasperation. In a quarrel which occurred at a royal banquet, one of the guests was slain; and, though the offending chieftain fled for protection to Columbkille, he was put to death by command of Diarmaid. The monarch on this occasion refused to recognise the right of any ecclesiastic to shield such a transgressor from punishment.[2] The spirit of the great churchman was roused to the utmost pitch of indignation by these proceedings. With difficulty he effected his escape from the palace of Tara, then the residence of the chief monarch;[3] and, when he reached the north, he stirred up his kinsmen—the princes of the house of HyNiall or O'Neill[4]—to proclaim war against Diarmaid. In A.D. 561 a great battle was fought near Sligo,[5] in which the men of Ulster were victorious, and their success was attributed to the prayers of Columbkille.

After the conflict, the disputed manuscript was given to the transcriber. It is asserted to be the same which has since been known as the "Cathach" or "The Warrior,"[6] and which is still preserved as a most precious relic of the antiquities of Ireland.[7] In days of superstition this copy of the Psalms was

---

[1] Reeves, *Adamnan*, p. 249. See also O'Donovan's *Annals of the Four Masters*, A.D. 555. According to some, Finnian's book was a copy of part of the Old and New Testament according to Jerome's version—quite a rarity at that time in Ireland. See Todd's *St. Patrick*, pp. 104—105.

[2] It is said that the offending chieftain was at the court of Diarmaid as a hostage; and as, according to the Brehon law, the deed which he had committed only involved a fine or eric, Columbkille was indignant because the king had been guilty of a double offence—first, in not respecting the safety of the hostage—and secondly, in inflicting a punishment which was illegal.

[3] In A.D. 565 the palace of Tara ceased to be a royal residence.

[4] *Mac*, prefixed to Irish names, signifies *son of*; *Ua*, now generally *O'*, signifies *grandson, great-grandson*, or any later descendant; *Hy* is the plural of *Ua* or *O'* and is more correctly written *Ui*; *Cinel* signifies race; *Siol*, seed or offspring; *Dal*, tribe. Todd's *St. Patrick*, p. 250.

[5] This was called the battle of Cul-Dreimhne or Cooldrevny, Reeves, *Adamnan* pp. 41, 42.

[6] Smiddy maintains that Cathach means "the house of God;" and that it was usual to give the name to "an ancient case containing relics." *Essay on Druids, Churches and Round Towers*, p. 159. Dublin, 1871.

[7] See Reeves, *Adamnan*, p. 319; Betham *Antiq. Res.*, I., p. 109; and

carried to the battle field, and its presence was considered as a sure pledge of victory.[1] But the conduct of Columbkille, about the time when he came into collision with King Diarmaid, seems to have been by no means satisfactory to the rulers of the Church—for they held a synod at Teltown, in Meath, at which he was excommunicated.[2]

His biographer, Adamnan, does not state precisely the grounds of this excommunication; and it is rather remarkable that he mentions it at all, as he is disposed to slur over anything unpleasant connected with his distinguished predecessor. He merely declares, in general terms, that the errors committed were "venial and excusable;" and that, as subsequently appeared, the sentence was injudicious.[3] Columbkille, as we have seen, had naturally a fiery temper; and it may be that he was blamed as the fomenter of a civil war: but it is not improbable that there were other articles in his indictment. Though only a presbyter, he had ventured, not only to contend with a bishop and to coerce him into submission, but to maintain that the king himself should not kill a homicide who had fled to a churchman for protection. As he was already at the head of several Irish monasteries, he was determined to magnify his position; and, as a presbyter abbot, he challenged peculiar deference. Shortly after this period,[4] he passed over with twelve companions,[5] to Hy or Iona, a little

---

O'Donovan's *Four Masters*, iv., 1233, *note.* See also O'Curry's *Lectures on the MS. Materials of Ancient Irish History*, pp. 321, 327.

[1] Reeves, 250, 319, 320, 321; Betham I., 109; Todd's *St. Patrick*, 125. Even in the history of the wars of the reign of Elizabeth we read of "Magroarty, who had the custody of the Cathach of St. Columbkille."—*Annals of Four Masters*, ad A.D. 1567.

[2] Reeves's *Adamnan.* Appendix to Preface lxxiii. and p. 193.

[3] "A quodam Synodo pro quibusdam venialibus et tam excusabilibus causis, non recte, ut post in fine claruit, sanctus excommunicaretur Columba." Lib. iii. § 3.

[4] Or in A.D. 563. There is much probability in the statement that Columbkille was now obliged to leave Ireland as a penance for involving the country in civil war. In the *Penitential* of Columbanus we meet with the following provision:—"Si quis clericus homicidium fecerit, et proximum suum occiderit, decem annis exsul poeniteat."—MIGNE, *Patr. Curs.*, tom. LXXX. 226.

[5] The names of these twelve companions are given in Reeves's *Adamnan*, additional notes, p. 245. Other Irishmen, who were contemporaries of Columbkille, and who have been ranked among his disciples, acquired celebrity. Of these we

island on the western coast of Scotland, where he established an Institute which long enjoyed the highest celebrity. He is known to posterity as *the Apostle of the Northern Picts*, and to him a great part of the country formerly designated Caledonia was indebted for the first rays of Christianity.

"When Justin the younger, the successor of Justinian, had the government of the Roman empire, there came into Britain," says Bede, "a famous presbyter and abbot—a monk by habit and life whose name was Columba—to preach the Word of God to the provinces of the northern Picts, who are separated from the southern parts by steep and rugged mountains. . . . Columba came into Britain in the ninth year of the reign of Bridius, who was the son of Meilochon, and the powerful king of the Pictish nation; and he converted that nation to the faith of Christ by his preaching and example—whereupon he also received from them the island [Iona] for a monastery; for it is not very large,[1] but contains about five families according to the English computation. His successors hold the island to this day; he was also buried therein having died at the age of seventy-seven, about thirty-two years[2] after he came into Britain to preach. . . . That island has for its ruler an abbot, who is a presbyter, to whose jurisdiction all the province, and even the bishops, according to an unusual arrangement, are subject, after the example of their first teacher, who was not a bishop, but a presbyter and monk—of whose life and discourses some writings are said to be preserved by his disciples. But whatever he was himself, this we know for certain that he left successors renowned for their

---

may mention Donnan, who, with about fifty others, is said to have been put to death by pirates, in A.D. 617, in Eigg, a small island of the Hebrides, north of Iona. Reeves's *Adamnan*, p. 223, *note*. Cormac, another of the disciples of Columba, distinguished himself by the daring character of his adventures at sea. In one of these adventures he is supposed to have gone as far as Iceland. Burton's *History of Scotland*, i. 279. See also Reeves's *Adamnan*, 265-274. There is every reason to believe that there were Irish missionaries in Iceland in the eighth century. See Lanigan iii. 220, 227-8, and Todd's *History of the Ancient Church of Ireland*, appendix p. 185, London, 1845.

[1] About three miles long and a mile broad.

[2] According to Adamnan he was thirty-four years in Iona, Lib. iii., c. 22. Bede also mistakes the date of the arrival of Columbkille in Scotland.

1867435

continency, their love of God, and observance of monastic rules. They followed, it is true, uncertain rules in the observance of the great festival [Easter] by reason of their being so far away from the rest of the world."[1]

The historian who makes these statements is a pious and learned English monk who flourished little more than a century after the death of Columbkille.[2] Accustomed to the ecclesiastical arrangements of the Church of Rome, he here speaks of the polity of Iona as something extraordinary. It appeared strange to him that even bishops were ordained by the presbyter abbot and his seniors,[3] and that they were subject to his jurisdiction. Some writers have endeavoured to explain away the language of Bede; but it is so precise and so pointed, that it is impossible by any fair interpretation to weaken its testimony. Had Bede himself been better acquainted with the history of monastic institutions in the east and west, he would not have been so much astonished at the position occupied by Columbkille and his successors. Before the days of the venerable Englishman, there were monasteries on the Continent where the presbyter abbot had the power of ordination.[4] The same power was previously exercised by the presbyter abbots in the monasteries of Egypt.[5] As early as A.D. 449, a presbyter abbot sat in one of the great councils of the Church, and exercised much influence over its deliberations.[6]

Among the legends relative to Columbkille, there is a story that when he applied for ordination to an episcopal friend named Etchen, he found that dignitary engaged in the humble

---

[1] Bede, book iii. c. iv.

[2] Bede died about A.D. 732.

[3] See Bede, iii. 5, where he represents the abbot and his senior monks as ordaining a bishop. We have historical evidence that there was no bishop resident in Iona, for the fact is expressly stated in the Saxon chronicle ad an. 565.

[4] Thus in the Rule of the Abbot Aurelian, a French bishop and the contemporary of Columbkille, we have the words:—"Et quando abbas voluerit, *ordinandi habeat potestatem.*"—MIGNE *Patrol. Cursus*, LXVIII. 392.

[5] See a case reported by Cassian, *Collatio*, iv., c. I.

[6] The Abbot Barsumas in the second council of Ephesus. About A.D. 697, Flann Febhla, abbot of Armagh, presided at a Synod where forty bishops and abbots were present. Reeves's *Adamnan*, 178, 179, *note*. Appendix to preface I.

occupation of a ploughman;[1] and that, by mistake, he was ordained a presbyter when he should have been ordained a bishop. When the blunder was discovered, Etchen immediately proposed to rectify it; but, according to the tradition, Columbkille peremptorily refused to accept any higher promotion. This tale is apparently the production of later times, and concocted to account for the peculiar position of the abbot of Iona. Columbkille was a man of learning; he knew that, as a presbyter, he was entitled to ordain; and he was not a person to shrink from the assertion of his privileges. If he did not exercise his right of ordination before he was excommunicated by the Irish Synod, he unquestionably did so afterwards. As his monastery of Iona was a college where youths were educated for the ministry, he and his seniors felt themselves fully justified in clothing their disciples with the pastoral office, and in sending them abroad as missionaries. Hence it was that so many bishops were subject to his jurisdiction. His brilliant success as the Apostle of the Northern Picts silenced opposition; and when he visited Ireland afterwards,[2] he was received with honour. In A.D. 574 he performed a ceremony which the Churches of Rome and England have always reserved for their highest functionaries. He ordained Aidan, king of the Scottish Dalriada.[3] The minister who ventured to ordain a king, would not surely have scrupled to ordain a deacon or a bishop.

---

[1] See the story in Todd's *St. Patrick*, p. 71.

[2] A.D. 575 he attended the convention at Drumceatt, near Newtownlimavaddy, where the independence of the kingdom of British Dalriada was recognised. He visited Ireland again about ten years afterwards. See Reeves's *Adamnan*, 91, 92. Appendix to preface, lxxvi. lxxviii.

[3] Imponensque manum super caput ejus, ordinans benedixit. Lib. iii., c. 5, *Adamnan*. In the *Senchus Mor*, or ancient Brehon law of Ireland, a doctor and bishop are regarded as of the same order. Thus, we read: "The King excels all in testimony . . . . except those of the *two* orders of religion or learning, who are of *equal rank with himself*, as *the doctor* or *the bishop*, or the pilgrim."—*Senchus Mor*, vol. i., p. 79. Dublin, 1865. Here the doctor and the bishop form one of the two orders, whilst the pilgrim forms the other. Columbkille was a doctor, as he was at the head of a literary institute. The bishop was also a doctor, as he superintended the religious instruction of the laity and preached to them.

The character of Columbkille, though not without some grave blemishes, presents very interesting and noble features. He had an intense relish for the Word of God; he was a devout observer of providences; and he spent much time in prayer. "In every affair," says one of his more recent biographers, "he showed the same spirit of piety. If he only ascended his little car—when a car became necessary—he implored upon it the benediction of Him who alone could give it power to carry, and whose providence could keep it from falling. If the milk from the fold passed him every day, every day it had his solemn benediction. If he looked on the corn by which his family was to be fed, he could not fail of saying, 'Blessed be God;' or, 'God bless it.' If the wind blew this way or that, he took occasion from it, either to pray to God, or to thank Him, with an eye to such of his friends as the course of it concerned. If he visited a pious friend, the first salutations were mixed with alleluiahs, and the soul had its spiritual entertainment before the body was yet refreshed. . . . If he administered even counsel or advice, he would accompany it with prayer to Him who disposeth the heart to listen, and sometimes he would accompany that prayer with fasting. His best advices could not remove some differences between an individual and his wife in Rachlin.[1] He therefore adds—'You two and I must spend this day in prayer and fasting.' This produced the desired effect, for the penitent wife at length confessed that she found she could obtain from God what to man seemed almost impossible."[2] He was chivalrous and enterprising; and when, leaving his royal kinsmen and his fatherland, he ventured in a frail bark to cross a stormy sea that he might plant the gospel among the savage tribes of Caledonia, he exhibited the spirit of a true missionary.

There is something singularly touching in the record of his

---

[1] See O'Donovan's *Four Masters*, i. 252, where it is alleged that the place was—not Rathlin—but the Island of Lambay, near Dublin. See also Reeves's *Adamnan*, 164, 165, *note*. Segienus, abbot of Iona, is said to have founded the Church of Rathlin upwards of thirty years after the death of Columbkille. See *Annals of the Four Masters*, ad. A.D. 630.

[2] Smith's *Life of Columba*, pp. 27, 37.

last hours on earth. He is said to have had a presentiment of his approaching end; and on the Saturday before his death, he observed—"This day is in the sacred volume called the Sabbath, which means *rest;* and to-day is verily a Sabbath for me, as it is the last with me of this present toilsome life, on which, after my wearisome labours, I come to enjoy my Sabbath."[1] Ascending the hill which overlooked the monastery, he stood there, surveying it for some time; and then, lifting up both his hands, bestowed on it his blessing. Returning to his chamber he resumed his daily task of transcribing the Psalter, and proceeded to the place where it is written: "They that seek the Lord shall not want any good thing."[2] "Here," said he, "at the close of the page I must stop;" and indicated that the copy must be finished by the hand of another. After some time he lay down to rest on the bare flag with a stone for his pillow. When the bell of the monastery rang for matins, he rose, and hastened to the church—but, before his brethren could join him, he was in a fainting condition. The dying man, unable to speak, made a feeble effort to raise his right hand to bless the fraternity; and then immediately expired.

Though the gospel had made much progress in Ireland in the days of Columbkille, it is evident that pagan superstitions still retained considerable influence. In the traditionary accounts of the battle fought in A.D. 561, near Sligo, between the kinsmen of the great abbot and king Diarmaid, the followers of the chief monarch are represented as practising heathen rites; and it is extremely doubtful whether many of them were even nominal Christians.[3] Monachism was ill fitted to promote the general improvement of the country. It presented religion under an artificial aspect, and sadly failed to cultivate and purify the social affections. Hence the holy

[1] *Adamnan*, iii. 23. Saturday, long after the commencement of the Christian dispensation, was called the Sabbath. The first day of the week was known as the Lord's Day. On this day the monks were indulged in somewhat more generous diet. It was forbidden to fast on the Lord's Day.

[2] Psalm xxxiv. 10.

[3] See O'Donovan's *Annals of the Four Masters*, i, 195, 6; and Petrie's "Antiq. of Tara Hill," *Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy*, xviii. *Antiq.* 123, 4.

and happy influence of the gospel was often unseen in the domestic circle, as well as in the intercourse of the tribes. We quite mistake if we form a very exalted estimate of the spiritual culture of the Irish churchmen of this period. Columbkille was concerned in no less than three noted battles; and one of these conflicts appears to have originated in disputes relative to ecclesiastical rights between himself and his brother abbot, Comghall, of Bangor.[1] On such occasions the monks fought hand to hand in the hostile armies.[2] Nor can it be deemed wonderful if Christian Ireland long retained traces of its earlier barbarism. The wilderness, under the appliances of the cultivator, is not made all at once to blossom as the rose; and we cannot expect to see the fairest fruits of the Spirit in a land of recent converts. Time is required to eradicate evil habits and prejudices; and ages may pass away before they have entirely disappeared. Christianity had not taught the kings of Ireland in the sixth century to live in peace; the saintly Columbkille is sometimes found stimulating the belligerents; and monks join keenly in the scenes of conflict. It is easier to sleep on a stone than to lay aside the pride of lineage; and many have practised the discipline of the cloister who have failed to mortify the lusts which war in the members.

---

[1] See Reeves's *Adamnan*, p. 253. This battle was fought about A.D. 585, near Coleraine. The battle of Cooldrevny has been already mentioned. The third battle was a renewal of the old strife between his royal kinsmen of Ulster, and the southern Princes, and was fought about A.D. 587, near Mullingar. See Reeves's *Adamnan*, p. 254, *note*.

[2] Reeves's *Adamnan*, p. 255.

CHAPTER III.

FROM THE DEATH OF COLUMBKILLE TO THE DEATH OF ADAMNAN, A.D. 597 TO A.D. 704.

IRISH MISSIONARIES, IRISH SEMINARIES, AND IRISH CIVILIZATION.

IN the seventh century Ireland was known by the designation of "The Isle of Saints." It was largely indebted for this honourable title to its monastic establishments—not a few of which were under the management of abbots eminent for piety and literature. The number of ascetics reported as connected with these seminaries is indeed amazing;[1] and we could not be charged with unreasonable scepticism were we to suspect exaggeration. Even prior to this period three thousand monks[2] are said to have been under the care of Comghall of Bangor—a teacher who had acquired wide celebrity. We must, however, recollect that these institutes were then almost the only schools for the education of the rising generation; that the early monks were not bound by irrevocable vows;[3] that multitudes, who cared little for

---

[1] Some high authorities have asserted that in the seventh century the Irish monks were equal in number to all the other inhabitants of the kingdom. See Archdall's *Monasticon Hibernicum*, Introduction, p. xi.

[2] Lanigan, ii. 63, 67. We must bear in mind that, according to the second Life quoted by Lanigan, all these monks were not congregated at Bangor—the head establishment. The 3,000 comprehended all under Comghall's jurisdiction. It is said that Finnian of Clonard had also 3,000 disciples, Lanigan, ii. 21. See also Reeves's *Adamnan*, 336.

[3] Waddington's *History of the Church*, p. 370, London 1833; Gieseler's *Text-book of Eccl. Hist.* i. 274, Philadelphia, 1836. The *Senchus Mor* speaks of "a young nun *who has not renounced her veil*," vol. ii. p. 405, Dublin, 1869.

learning, were drawn to the monasteries by the attractions of novelty or the love of excitement; and that, in a country covered with timber, a rude people, accustomed to provide themselves with extemporaneous dwellings in the woods, could have found small difficulty in obtaining anywhere the usual amount of accommodation.[1] Though Ireland was disturbed by domestic feuds, it was, as compared with other lands, in the enjoyment of quiet and prosperity. When South Britain was conquered by the Saxons, and when the West of Europe was invaded and desolated by the Northern Barbarians, it remained free from foreign aggression. Thus it was that, for the greater part of the seventh century, the island was regarded as the abode of peace, and the asylum of literature. Students flocked to its shores from the Continent, as well as from England; and its reputation rapidly extended over the whole of Western Christendom.

On other grounds, Ireland, in the seventh century, might have claimed the designation of "The Isle of Saints," for its missionaries laboured with singular success in France,[2] Germany, Switzerland, and Italy, as well as in Great Britain. Among the most distinguished of these heralds of the cross was Columbanus, the disciple of Comghall, abbot of Bangor. Columbanus was a native of Leinster; he is said to have been of respectable parentage; and, as he grew up, he commended himself to general favour by a pleasing address and a handsome person.[3] He had a great thirst for information; he applied himself with much ardour to the study of rhetoric, geometry, and other branches of education then taught in Ireland; he was an excellent Latin scholar; he had a know-

[1] It would appear that the young scholars lived in huts erected extempore in the immediate neighbourhood of the church. It is said that they were wont to build a village, or villages, of huts as near to the school—which was kept in the church—as they conveniently could. See the account of Columbkille's hut in O'Curry's *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Irish* by Sullivan, vol. ii. 80, 81, London 1873.

[2] Ebrard gives the name of 48 Culdee monasteries established in France. *Zeitschrift für historische Theologie*, 1863, p. 526.

[3] His life has been written by Jonas, a monk of the monastery of Bobbio, who flourished in the seventh century, not long after the time of Columbanus. It may be found in Migne's *Patr. Cursus*, tom. lxxxvii. See also Lanigan, ii. 263.

ledge of Greek[1]—an attainment then rare in the Western Church; and he was not ignorant of at least the elements of Hebrew.[2] But his great delight was in the study of the Holy Scriptures. About A.D. 589, when somewhat advanced in life,[3] he was seized with an irrepressible desire to preach the gospel to the heathen; and, setting out, like Columbkille, with twelve companions, he at first passed over into South Britain. Obtaining, as it would appear, no encouragement in that country, he almost immediately removed to France, and settled in Burgundy. At a place called Luxovium—even then famous for its hot springs[4]—he erected a monastery which soon became famous; and two other institutions of the same character, and in the same district, which were occupied by his disciples, remained subject to his jurisdiction.[5]

The discipline of the establishments over which Columbanus presided was exceedingly austere. No one was at liberty to question the authority of the superior; and the will of the abbot was to be the rule of the monastery. The food of the inmates—consisting of herbs, meal and water, and bread of the coarsest description—was barely sufficient to sustain life.[6] Very little conversation was allowed. Whipping was the grand ordinance employed for the correction of the brotherhood. He who neglected to repeat the *Amen*, when the blessing was asked, was to receive six lashes; and he who did not keep silence at meals was to be visited with the same

[1] In his *Ad Fedolium Epistola*, he exhibits his acquaintance with the Greek poets. See *Patr. Cursus*, tom. lxxx. 292. It has been very properly observed that his classical knowledge must have been acquired before he left Ireland.

[2] In his Epistle to Boniface IV. Columbanus gives evidence of some knowledge of Hebrew when referring to his own name. See Migne, *Patr. Curs.*, tom. lxxx. 274.

[3] At this time he must have been nearly fifty years of age. The year 559, the date often assigned for his birth—is obviously erroneous. He died A.D. 615; and, some time before, he had attained the age of 72. See Lanigan, ii. 296–7. According to the present text of his biographer Jonas he was only twenty when he left Ireland; but this must be a mistake—perhaps for fifty.

[4] Now Luxeuil. Ibique aquae calidae cultu eximio constructae habebantur. *Vita S. Columbani, abbatis auctore Iona*, § 17. *Patr. Cursus.* lxxxvii, 1022.

[5] See Lanigan, ii. 267.

[6] "Regula Cœnobialis," caput ii. *Patr. Curs.*, lxxx. 210.

amount of chastisement.[1] Sometimes the discipline of fasting was substituted for the discipline of flagellation. "If any brother be disobedient, let him," said the Rule of Columbanus, "be two days on one biscuit and water. If any one be contradictory, or breaks a command or regulation, let him be two days on one biscuit."[2] Certain psalms and prayers were to be repeated at appointed times; and the length of the exercises varied according to the length of the nights at different seasons.

Columbanus and his companions had not long taken up their abode in Burgundy when they won the favour of almost the whole surrounding population. Their benevolence commended them to the poor; their learning secured the regard of the higher classes. Their popularity eventually awakened the jealousy of the native clergy; and their nonconformity, particularly in the mode of keeping Easter, exposed them to much obloquy. At this time Gregory I—known as Gregory the Great—filled the papal chair; and Columbanus deemed it prudent to apply by letter to him for advice—not because he was prepared to submit implicitly to his decision, whatever it might be—but because he expected salutary counsel from a bishop of such reputed sanctity and wisdom. In this letter he shows that he is well acquainted with the history of the controversy; and he does not hesitate to express his disapproval of the conduct of Gregory's predecessor, Victor, who, four hundred years before, had disturbed the Church by his dictatorial bearing. He boldly asks the Pope his opinion of such bishops as ordained for money; and naively intimates that those who scruple to communicate with him, because he differed from them in a matter comparatively trivial, overlooked questions of the gravest importance. He does not appear to have received any reply to this outspoken communication; and when the French clergy met in Synod to consider how they were to act, he addressed to them an epistle[3] in which he strenuously contends for the mode of

[1] Regula, caput, x.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] This letter is addressed: "Dominis sanctis, et in Christo patribus, vel fratribus, episcopis, presbyteris, caeterisque sanctae ecclesiae ordinibus."

observance practised in the Irish Church. "Let us," said he, "in peace and charity live quietly in these woods beside the bones of our seventeen departed brethren, as hitherto for twelve years[1] we have lived among you, that we may pray for you as we ought, and as we have done till now. . . . Our canons are the commands of the Lord and His apostles. . . . In these we prayerfully desire to persevere till death, as we have also seen our elders do. . . . Without the dissatisfaction of any, let those observances be respected which are more in accordance with the Old and New Testaments."[2] These remonstrances appear to have produced little impression on the Synod—for the controversy was continued; and Columbanus, in consequence, addressed another letter to a succeeding Pope,[3] in which he contends for his right to observe the usages of his Irish predecessors. He pleads that a canon of the Second Œcumenical Council, held at Constantinople in A.D. 381,[4] warranted the churches of God among the barbarians to maintain the customs of their fathers. As Ireland had never formed part of the Roman Empire, it was clearly entitled to this privilege; but it is by no means so plain that Irishmen, who had made France the land of their adoption, were empowered by the canon to persist in their nonconformity.

New trials awaited Columbanus. Clovis, known as the founder of the French monarchy, and the eldest son of the Catholic Church, was a Christian only in name; his kingdom was divided after his death; and his descendants were noted for their ungodliness. Perjury, polygamy, adultery, and murder continually stain the annals of these crowned personages. No wonder that the spirit of Columbanus was stirred within him when he visited the Court of Thierry, or Theodoric, who reigned over the Burgundians. The intrepid abbot, like

---

[1] This letter appears to have been written about A.D. 601.

[2] *Patr. Cursus.* tom. lxxx. 266–7.

[3] In Migne's *Patr. Curs.*, (lxxx. 268), this letter is addressed to Boniface IV; but the title of the Pope is not given in the superscription itself, and it was probably addressed to the immediate successor of Gregory—Sabinian—who became Pope A.D. 604, and died in the beginning of A.D. 606.

[4] Canon 2.

another John the Baptist, denounced the vices of the monarch; and sternly condemned the shameless manner in which he lived in the midst of his mistresses. He refused to bless the king's children, the fruits of his amours; declined to partake of the viands of a royal banquet set before him; and threatened Thierry with excommunication.[1] The Prince, under other circumstances, would at once have consigned the man who acted thus to the hands of the executioner; but he was awed by the sanctity of Columbanus; and, irritated as he was, he exclaimed that he was not mad enough to give him the crown of martyrdom. He merely commanded him to be dragged from his convent, and sent back to Ireland. The officers entrusted with the execution of these orders approached the abbot on their knees; and so greatly did the mass of the people venerate him for his piety, that he was conducted in a species of triumph to the borders of Thierry's dominions.[2]

Instead of returning to Ireland, Columbanus resolved to remain on the Continent; and, after travelling through various parts of the country, at length made his way into Switzerland. His ministry in that country produced good fruit, as he succeeded in reclaiming many who had relapsed into paganism. He stopped for a year at Bregentz on the Lake of Constance; but as his position was meanwhile rendered insecure by political changes, he determined on another removal. Leaving behind him his disciple Gallus[3] ill of fever, he set out with the rest of his fraternity to Italy, where he was kindly received by

---

[1] Jonas, his biographer, expressly mentions this threat of excommunication: "comminaturque excommunicationem, si emendare dilatando non vellet," § 32. "Columbanus, *who was only a priest*," says Dr. Lanigan, "was too well acquainted with the discipline of the Church to imagine that he could inflict such a punishment as general excommunication."—*Ecc. Hist.* ii. 279. Dr. Lanigan seems to have forgotten that a presbyter-abbot, such as Columbanus or Columbkille claimed authority even over bishops. Columbkille excommunicated.—*Adamnan*, lib. ii. c. 24.

[2] He left Luxeuil about A.D. 610.

[3] There is reason to believe that Columbanus, like Columbkille, introduced his disciples into the ministry by ordination. On any other supposition it is difficult to understand how he kept up his fraternity in a foreign country and among hostile bishops. Walafrid Strabo, the biographer of Gallus, says of him:—"Qua

Agilulf, King of the Lombards. By permission of that prince he built, about A.D. 613, a monastery at Bobbio, in the Apennines; and the fame of the founder greatly promoted the prosperity of the establishment; but he did not long survive its erection. He died, at an advanced age, in A.D. 615.

About the time of his settlement at Bobbio, Columbanus addressed to Boniface IV. a remonstrance which, in tone and spirit, presents a striking contrast to the letters commonly written by the western clergy to the head of the Roman Church. It relates to a subject which has long since ceased to possess interest—the condemnation of what were called the Three Articles or Chapters[1] by the General Council of Constantinople, in A.D. 553. Columbanus conceived that this condemnation involved an approval of Eutychianism, and encouraged those who held that there is only one nature in Christ. The decision had generated most unhappy disputes in various parts of Italy;[2] and Columbanus states that he had been instigated by the King of the Lombards to bring it under the notice of the Pope. Agilulf, as an Arian, could not be expected to sympathise with the disputants on either side; but, as a king, he was anxious for the peace of his dominions. The selection of the abbot as his advocate attests how highly he appreciated his integrity, ability, and learning. In the superscription of his letter, Columbanus styles Boniface "The most beautiful head of all the churches of the whole of Europe, the very sweet Pope, the very high prelate, the pastor of pastors, the most reverend watchman:" but it is somewhat doubtful whether the pontiff, after all, was greatly gratified by this profusion of complimentary epithets. Irishmen, even in those days, were rather given to rhetorical flourishes; and it

---

sapientiae maturitate factum est ut universorum communi concilio, et *jussione Columbani abbatis*, per singulos sacrae promotionis gradus ascendens, *invitus sacerdotii susciperet dignitatem.*"—Lib. i. cap. 1.—See *Patr. Curs.* tom. cxiv. 979.

[1] That is, the condemnation of Theodore, Bishop of Mopsuestia, and the condemnation of certain writings by Theodoret and Ibas. See Gieseler's *Text-book of Ecc. Hist.* i. 324-5.

[2] After the Council of Constantinople in A.D. 553, of the proceedings of which Pope Vigilius was induced to approve, North Africa, North Italy, and Illyria, seceded from the communion of the Church of Rome.

certainly did not follow that the abbot acknowledged the supremacy of the Pope when he heaped on him these fair titles. Long after this period we find a certain Irish hermit styled "Head of the West of Europe for piety and wisdom;"[1] and an Irish bishop, named Donnell O'Heney, designated "Archbishop of West Europe."[2] The Pope now aspired to a universal prelacy; and he could not therefore have been altogether satisfied when described merely as a watchman of the churches *of Europe*. As he proceeded with the perusal of the letter, how deeply must Boniface have been mortified when he discovered that, in the estimation of Columbanus, the Bishop of Jerusalem was even a more exalted personage than the Bishop of Rome! "You are well nigh celestial," said his Irish correspondent, "and Rome is the head of the churches of the world, *saving the singular prerogative of the place of the Lord's resurrection*."[3] Columbanus was not afraid to make statements which must have been still more unwelcome to the great Western Patriarch. He intimated that Boniface lay under suspicion of heresy, and exhorted him with all earnestness to take steps for the removal of so foul an imputation. "That you may not lack apostolic honour," says he, "preserve the apostolic faith. Confirm it by testimony, strengthen it by writing, fortify it by synodical authority—that none may justly resist you. . . . The world is now drawing to an end; the Prince of Pastors is approaching: beware lest he find you negligent, and beating your fellow-servants. . . . Watch, therefore, I beseech you, O Pope. Watch, and again I say, watch—because Vigilius did not watch well.[4] . . . One must grieve and mourn if, in the Apostolic

[1] See King's *Memoir*, Introductory to the early history of the Primacy of Armagh, p. 16. Armagh, 1854.

[2] *Ibid* p. 15.

[3] "Roma orbis terrarum caput est ecclesiarum, salva loci dominicae resurrectionis singulari prerogativa." At this time the Bishop of Jerusalem was one of the great Patriarchs of the East; but in the following century he was overwhelmed by the Saracens.

[4] Vigilius was Pope at the time of the Council of Constantinople in A.D. 553, when the condemnation of the three Articles was adopted. Columbanus here alludes to his name, which denotes *more watchful*. Vigilius was a very worthless prelate; and when in the papal chair was actually *excommunicated* by an African Synod. See Migne *Patrol. Curs.*, tom. lxviii. 958.

See, the Catholic faith be not maintained. . . . It is your fault if you have deviated from the true trust, and have made void the first faith; deservedly your juniors withstand you, and deservedly they do not communicate with you. . . . For if these things are certain instead of fabulous, the tables are turned, and your sons are changed into *the head, and you into the tail*—which is sad even to mention: therefore, also they shall be your judges who have always preserved the orthodox faith, whoever they may be, even though they appear to be your juniors. For they are orthodox and true catholics who have never at any time received or defended either heretics or any suspected persons, but have persisted in their zealous attachment to the true faith."[1]

It is easy to see from this epistle what were the views entertained by Columbanus in reference to the Western Patriarch. He admitted the antiquity of the Roman Church; he acknowledged the general respectability of the Roman Bishops; he recognised their high social position and their extensive influence; but he had no idea of making them the arbiters of his faith or practice. He did not believe that infallibility pertained to the occupant of the Roman chair;[2] he thought it quite possible that the Pope might fall into deadly heresy; and, when a Vigilius or a Boniface departed from the faith, Columbanus was prepared to withstand him to the face, and, if necessary, to renounce his fellowship. The Holy Scriptures were the only standard to which he was ready to yield submission. "All we Irish," said he,[3] are disciples of Saint

[1] This letter may be found in Migne. *Pat. Curs.*, tom. lxxx. 274, 283.

[2] The late Professor Kelly of Maynooth admits this fact in terms which imply that he himself agreed with Columbanus. "He cannot be cited," says Dr. Kelly, "as a witness of the *Ultramontane opinion* of the Pope's infallibility."—*Dissertations on Irish Church History*, p. 265. Dublin, 1864. Professor Kelly died in 1858, in the 45th year of his age. His contributions to *Irish Church History* are very valuable, and often exhibit an amount of candour seldom to be found in writers of his communion.

[3] "Nos enim SS. Petri et Pauli et omnium discipulorum, divinum canonem Spiritu sancto scribentium, discipuli sumus, toti Hiberni, ultimi habitatores mundi, nihil extra evangelicam et apostolicam doctrinam recipientes: nullus haereticus, nullus Judaeus, nullus schismaticus fuit: sed fides catholica, sicut a vobis primum—sanctorum scilicet apostolorum successoribus—tradita est, inconcussa tenetur." Lanigan, ii. 290; Carew, *Ecc. Hist.* 256; Kelly, *Dissert.* 252, and other Roman

Peter and Saint Paul, and *of all the disciples who wrote the divine canon under the guidance of the Holy Spirit;* we dwell at the ends of the earth; *we receive nothing beyond the evangelical and apostolical doctrine*; not one of us has been a heretic, or a Jew, or a schismatic; but the Catholic faith is preserved among us intact as it was *originally* handed down by you—I mean the successors of the holy apostles."

There are many things in the character of Columbanus which we cannot but admire. He was evidently one of the nobles of nature, a man of true genius, of lofty enthusiasm, and of indomitable energy. He had a taste for poetry; and some of his Latin metrical compositions have reached our times.[1] He cheerfully submitted to the greatest privations that he might propagate the gospel among the pagans of Burgundy, Helvetia, and North Italy: he lived sometimes in the desert, for weeks or months together, on herbs and wild fruits; he taught the disciples who followed him to encounter the greatest difficulties without murmuring and without fear; and he diffused such a gentle influence around him that all classes were constrained to treat him with kindness and with deference. If he commanded the respect of kings, he did not succeed by acting as a truckler or a time-server. He was not afraid to rebuke vice wherever it appeared; and even when the Roman Pontiff faltered in his duty, Columbanus could not look on in silence. Throughout life he received the homage which conscience is constrained to pay to the wise and the good, the courageous and the truthful.

Catholic writers, misrepresent this statement. They describe Columbanus as saying that the doctrine of the Irish was taught to them at first *by the bishops of Rome.* The Abbot makes no such affirmation. He simply avers that the faith of his countrymen was as pure as that which was held and taught *at first* by the Roman Church. He hints that it was at present somewhat purer, as the Pope had now fallen under the suspicion of heresy. It is to be observed also that he here speaks, not of the successor, but of the *successors* of the apostles—indicating that the Bishop of Rome was only one among many entitled to that designation.

[1] They may be found in Ussher's works by Elrington, iv. 409-20; and Migne *Patr. Curs.* lxxx. 286-295. A Latin exposition of the Psalms, by Columbanus, with Irish glosses, is said to be still extant in the Ambrosian library at Milan. See Dr. Ebrard "On the Culdee Church," *Zeitschrift für historische Theologie*, 1863, p. 329.

One of the twelve Irishmen who accompanied Columbanus to the continent also earned distinction in the missionary field. We have seen that, when the abbot removed from Switzerland to Italy, he left behind him his disciple Gallus languishing in fever. The monk recovered; remained in the country; and, having gathered around him twelve brethren of a kindred spirit, settled with his fraternity in a place since known as the town of St. Gall. A canton of the same name still perpetuates his memory. He did much to promote a knowledge of the gospel among the rude inhabitants who flocked to him for instruction; and, so signal were the services he rendered, that he has been called by some the *Apostle of Switzerland*.[1] He is said to have died at the age of ninety-five, in A.D. 645.[2]

At a later period of the seventh century another Irishman, named Kilian or Killen,[3] signalized himself as an efficient continental missionary. Travelling into Germany with a number of companions, he took up his residence at Würzburg—where he succeeded in converting the Duke, and in reclaiming many of the people from heathenism. According to the legendary tale of a later age, he went to Rome that he might obtain permission from the Pope to prosecute his mission; and it is alleged that, in the Italian metropolis, he was invested with the episcopal dignity; but this story contains internal proofs of fabrication; as, at that time, such a proceeding on the part of an Irish churchman was quite unprecedented. We have, besides, direct proof that Kilian was a bishop before he left his native country.[4] His fidelity to his convictions cost him

[1] See Robertson's *History of the Christian Church*, ii. 31.

[2] Lanigan, ii. 437. *The Life of Gallus* has been written by Walafrid Strabo, who died Abbot of Richenau about the middle of the ninth century. It may be found in Migne. *Patr. Curs.* cxiv. 975.

[3] The name is variously written Kilian, Quilian, Chilian, Kyllena, and Killen. See Murdock's *Mosheim*, ii. 64; and Lanigan, i. 270. There was in ancient times a church known as the Church of Cillen or Killen, in County Down, in the territory of Lecale. See Archdall's *Monasticon Hibernicum*, by Moran, p. 282, *note*. Many persons of the name Killen still reside in Lecale and the neighbourhood.

[4] This fact is stated in the oldest *Life of Kilian*. See Lanigan, iii. 115, 118, 119, 120.

his life. The Duke of Würzburg, whose name was Gozbert, was married to his brother's wife; and, some time after his baptism, Kilian pointed out to the converted chief the impropriety of such a connection. Gozbert was prepared to yield to the representations of his spiritual adviser; but, when his consort Geilan heard of her intended separation, she took advantage of an opportunity afforded her by the Duke's absence, and instigated an assassin to murder the missionary. Kilian has since been honoured as *the Apostle of Franconia*. The year A.D. 689 has been assigned as the date of his martyrdom.[1]

Fursey, Livin, Fridolin, and other Irishmen, also distinguished themselves by their evangelical labours[2] on the continent in the seventh century. These missionaries—so numerous and so celebrated—remind us of the character of the early Hibernian seminaries. They were not merely schools for secular instruction—though in point of general literature, the teachers were far in advance of almost all their contemporaries in Europe. At a time when Pope Gregory the Great was obliged to acknowledge that he was ignorant of Greek,[3] there were ministers in Ireland quite competent to read the New Testament in the original language. In the larger monasteries the disciples were instructed in mathematics and astronomy,[4] as well as in ancient classics; the Irish appear to have been the first who composed Latin rhymes;[5] they were noted for their love of poetry; and they had been long accustomed to listen with delight to the music of the

[1] According to Mosheim, Kilian was martyred A.D. 696. This date is probably a mistake. According to some, he was the first bishop of Würzburg: but the bishopric was not erected till long after his death.

[2] Fursey was son of a Munster prince. He acted as a missionary, first in England, and afterwards in France. He became superior of a monastery at St. Quentin, near Peronne, where he died about A.D. 676. Livin, a distinguished Irish missionary, was martyred in the Low Countries about A.D. 656. Fridolin, surnamed *The Traveller*, another famous Irishman, died at Seckingen on the Rhine, where he had founded a monastery. Fiacre, another Irishman, settled in France. See Lanigan, ii. 449-465; ii. 468; ii. 446-7; Neander, v. 46; Moore, i. 278.

[3] See his Epistles, vii. 32; xi. 74.

[4] The Epistle of Cummian, in reference to the Paschal cycle, supplies good evidence of the state of learning in Ireland in his time. See Ch. iv. p. 64.

[5] See Moore's *History of Ireland*, i. 311.

harp—their favourite instrument.[1] But they were particularly famous for their knowledge of the Holy Scriptures; and their love of Bible truth was the parent of their missionary zeal. Bede tells us that, at an advanced period of the seventh century, many of the English nobility, with others of their countrymen, flocked to Ireland for religious instruction. "The Irish," says he, "most willingly received them all, and took care to give them their daily sustenance without charge, as well as to furnish them with books to read, and gratuitous tuition."[2]

This resort of students to Ireland did not fail to excite jealousy on the part of Anglican churchmen. In A.D. 668 an eastern monk named Theodore, one of the most learned men of his age, was made Archbishop of Canterbury; and though he was far advanced in life at the period of his elevation to the primacy, he continued for many years afterwards to render good service to his adopted country. He gave instruction himself;[3] he established schools throughout South Britain; and he laboured in various other ways to promote the cause of education. He was accompanied into England by another foreigner, named Adrian, who aided him most efficiently in his efforts to diffuse a taste for literature. The fame of these two distinguished scholars did not put an end to the resort of students to Ireland; and Aldhelm, abbot of Malmesbury, writing about the end of the seventh century, can scarcely express himself with calmness when adverting to their continued migration. "Why," said he, "should Ireland —whither troops of students are carried in fleets from this country—enjoy any such ineffable distinction, as if here, in

[1] One of Columbkille's disciples thus laments the death of his master:—"Like a song to a harp without the ceis (bass-string) are we after being deprived of our noble." O'Donovan's *Annals of the Four Masters*, at A.D. 593. See also Columbanus, *Ad Hibernos*, No. iv. p. 12, *note*. O'Curry maintains that the *ceis* "was no material part of the harp at all, but that the word signifies simply the harmonized tones or tune of the instrument." *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Irish* by Sullivan, iii. 253.

[2] Bede, iii. 27.

[3] He is said to have been the teacher of the Venerable Bede, one of the most distinguished scholars of the eighth century. See Collier's *Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain*, i. 263. London, 1840.

the rich soil of England, Greek masters or Roman chiefs cannot be found, who can solve the tough problems of the heavenly library to inquiring sciolists? Though Ireland rich and flourishing in students and lectors—resembling, so to speak, the numerous flocks in the pastures—is adorned, like the poles of heaven, with the twinklings of stars in sparkling constellations, yet Britain of western clime, placed almost on the extreme margin of the world, possesses, as it were, a splendid illustration of the flaming sun and of the moon. I speak of the Pontiff Theodore, nurtured from the beginning of his education in the best philosophical learning. I speak also of Adrian, his companion, inexpressibly endowed with choice accomplishments. Boldly and openly bearing my testimony, the deceitful trifling of falsehood being laid aside, the impartial judgment of truth holding the balance, I shall give my decision. Though Theodore, of blessed memory,[1] guiding the helm of the high priesthood, were surrounded with a crowd of Hibernian scholars—as a fierce boar in the midst of a growling ring of mastiffs—with his grammatical tooth at once ready for the onslaught, he scatters with ease the rebel phalanxes."[2] These words were addressed to Eahfrid, a young Englishman who had just returned from Ireland after having spent there six years in study; and though Aldhelm professes to speak very much in the style of banter, it is quite evident that he was more than half in earnest, and that he could not well conceal the mortification with which he viewed the high reputation still maintained by the Hibernian seminaries. Such an exhibition of feeling came with a very indifferent grace from this abbot of Malmesbury, who had himself been indebted for his instruction to Maildufˇ, a learned Irishman, said to have been the founder of his monastery.[3]

---

[1] Theodore died A.D. 690, at the age of 88. He must have died some time before these words were written.

[2] Epistle xiii. Ussher's *Sylloge*, Works, iv. 451-2. Aldhelm's works may be found in Migne, *Patrol. Curs.* tom. lxxxix.

[3] *William of Malmesbury*, i. 2; and Lanigan, iii. 98. The place was, it appears, at first called Maildufsbury—changed into Malmesbury. Bede speaks of Aldhelm as "Abbas monasterii quod Maildufi urbem nuncupant." Lib. v. 18. As to Aldhelm, see afterwards Chap. iv. p. 61, *note* 2.

But though Ireland in the seventh century enjoyed a distinguished reputation for literature and piety among the nations of Europe, we greatly mistake if we imagine that the designation "Isle of Saints" was fairly descriptive of the general character of its population. At that time the entire West was sunk in intellectual as well as spiritual degradation; the French Kings—the eldest sons of the church—were monsters of iniquity;[1] and even the Italian Bishops were so ignorant that the Pope was obliged to apologise for the rusticity of the deputies he then sent into the East to represent him in the Sixth Œcumenical Council.[2] Though Ireland stood so high among the nations of Europe, its inhabitants could not boast, after all, of any very advanced state of civilization. The monkish austerities of its men of learning fostered their spiritual pride, and impaired their intellectual vigour. Whilst the Hibernian saints were so remarkable for their self-denial, their nobility of spirit, and their missionary zeal, their credulity was most childish; and many of them were sadly deficient in the meekness and gentleness of the gospel. Some allowance should perhaps be made for an excitable temperament; but, if we are to credit their biographers, they not unfrequently indulged without compunction in gusts of passion, and poured out imprecations on all who ventured to thwart them in their designs. No wonder that the petty kings and chieftains of the country were so often engaged in hostilities, when their spiritual guides sometimes fomented the discord; and too seldom, by their own example, inculcated the duties of forbearance and forgiveness. In war, both sexes marched to the battle-field; but, about the close of the seventh century, Adamnan, abbot of Hy, secured with difficulty the adoption of a law releasing females from military service.[3] The monks, at this time, seem to have cared for no such immunity. When rival fraternities quarrelled, the brethren did not scruple to gird on the sword and decide the contest

[1] See *Gregory of Tours*, iv. 28.

[2] In A.D. 680. See the apology of Pope Agatho in Migne, *Patr. Curs.* lxxvii. 1164.

[3] Reeves's *Adamnan*. Appendix to preface l. and liii.

in a deadly encounter. Later annalists have attempted, by concealment,[1] to extinguish the memory of these ecclesiastical scandals; but the facts crop out in more ancient records; and it was not until the beginning of the ninth century that an enactment was made exempting the "clergy of Ireland for ever from expeditions and hostings."[2]

---

[1] See Reeves's *Adamnan*. Additional notes, 255. See also *Annals of Loch Cé*, vol. i. preface p. 41. London, 1871; and O'Donovan's *Four Masters*, i. 413, note. In Archbishop Colton's *Visitation* by Reeves, p. 94, the reader may find records of many wars of the monks in the eighth and ninth centuries.

[2] This law was made A.D. 804. Reeves's *Adamnan*. Additional notes, 255. See also O'Donovan's *Four Masters*, at A.D. 799.

CHAPTER IV.

FROM THE DEATH OF COLUMBKILLE TO THE DEATH OF ADAMNAN. A.D. 597 TO A.D. 704.

THE EASTER CONTROVERSY AND THE CLAIMS OF ARMAGH.

WHILST Columbanus, Gallus, Kilian, and other Irish missionaries, were labouring with so much success on the Continent of Europe, changes of considerable importance were taking place at home. The year in which Columbkille died, (A.D. 597), marks the commencement of a new era in the ecclesiastical history of the British Isles. Exactly at that date the monk Augustine, with his forty companions, arrived in England on a mission from Rome. He was deputed by Pope Gregory the Great to attempt the conversion of the pagan Saxons then in possession of the country. His mission was a great success; for kingdom after kingdom of the heptarchy embraced the Christian faith. But these gratifying results are not to be ascribed entirely to the labours of the agents of Gregory: as missionaries from the monastery of Iona—most of whom appear to have been Irishmen—co-operated efficiently in the work of evangelization. It has been shown that the inhabitants of by far the greater part of England were converted by these Scottish and Irish preachers.[1]

The Romish monks, sent on the mission to South Britain,

[1] Ussher's *Religion of the Ancient Irish and British*, chap. x. Works, iv. 357. "We are bound to remember," says Dr. Wordsworth, the present bishop of Lincoln, "that in a great measure, we owe our Christianity to Ireland: and, alas! we may not forget, that Ireland owes her Romanism to us." *History of the Church of Ireland*, p. 76.

were narrow-minded ritualists, who regarded scrupulous conformity to the Italian mode of worship as one of the great points of evangelical obedience. Their intolerance and bigotry brought them very soon into collision with the remnant of the old British Church in Wales, as well as with the ministers from Iona; and a dispute relative to the time, if not to the manner,[1] of observing Easter, created immense excitement. The parties differed as to the time of celebration—sometimes to the extent of several weeks; and this divergence was all the more embarrassing as it involved a discrepancy in the keeping of various festivals and fasts, removed, at certain distances, from the Paschal solemnity.[2] It has been asserted that the Irish originally observed the Roman mode of keeping Easter; and that the diversity, which now caused such disputation, was created by a change of cycle adopted recently in Italy; but the Irish themselves repudiate this explanation; and there is reason to believe that the Hibernian rule of celebration, from whatever source it was derived, never exactly corresponded to the Roman model.[3]

The Irish and British differed, in other observances, from the adherents of the Pope. Among these, one of the most obvious points of disagreement was the style of clerical tonsure. The shaving of the head by the ministers of religion was a rite borrowed from heathenism,[4] which found its way

[1] The Asiatics differed from the church of Rome as to the mode, as well as to the time, of keeping Easter. The same may have been the case with the Irish; but we have no distinct evidence remaining on the subject.

[2] Whitsuntide, for example, was seven weeks after the Paschal feast; and a period of fasting preceded the Paschal celebration.

[3] Lanigan has laboured with great industry to prove that the mode of keeping Easter observed by the Irish was received from Rome: but his reasoning is fairly set aside by two plain testimonies: 1st. Cummian, in his famous *Paschal Epistle*, expressly distinguishes the Irish system, or, as he styles it, that "*of our holy Pope Patrick*," from the one current at Rome at the time of the Council of Nice. See the Epistle in Ussher's *Sylloge*, Works, vol. iv. 440. Elrington's edition. 2nd. The Irish Colman at the conference of Whitby (A.D. 664) says: "The Easter which I keep I received from my elders who sent me bishop hither. It is the same which *the Blessed John the Evangelist* . . . is recorded to have observed." It would thus appear that the Irish sided with the Quartodecimans in opposition to the church of Rome. See Bede, iii. 25, 26. Lanigan himself admits that the Irish mode in some respects differed from the Roman, ii. 319.

[4] We find it condemned in Ezek. xliv. 20; Lev. xxi. 5.

into the Christian Church through the channel of the monasteries. Several modes of tonsure soon prevailed; and each party contended for its own fashion with no little pertinacity. The Romish clergy shaved the crown—thus imitating, as some fancy, the crown of thorns put on the head of our Saviour; the Irish shaved the forehead, and extended the operation from ear to ear—thinking, perhaps, in this way to give themselves a more austere or impressive aspect. These peculiarities were trivial; and neither the Irish nor British appear to have expressed any desire to impose their usages on the strangers from Rome; but these strangers pursued a less accommodating course; and because the others did not conform to them, even in the cut of the hair, expressed the deepest dissatisfaction.

Some writers have alleged that the mode of keeping Easter, and the style of clerical tonsure, were the only points in controversy between the Romish missionaries and the native clergy of Britain and Ireland. These questions at once brought the parties into open antagonism, and thus attracted special notice; but other matters—some of which were of far greater importance—contributed to their alienation. Aldhelm, abbot of Malmesbury—already mentioned[1]—who, by order of an English Synod, wrote against "the error of the Britons" towards the close of the seventh century, affirms that, whilst they did not celebrate Easter at the proper time, they held "*very many other things* contrary to ecclesiastical chastity and peace."[2] It can be clearly shown that the Irish at this period deviated, in various ways, from the Romish discipline.

The early Irish Church does not appear to have observed what is called *confirmation*. This rite, unknown in primitive times—was, when first introduced, a kind of supplement to baptism, and was intended to make up for any defects connected with the irregular administration of that ordinance.

[1] See immediately preceding chapter, p. 53, and p. 61. *note* (2) of this chapter.

[2] Bede, v. 18, "*Alia perplura ecclesiasticae castitati* et paci contraria gerunt." These words suggest, among other things, that the British and probably the Irish Church did not insist, like the Roman, on the celibacy of the clergy.

By degrees it assumed a more imposing form, was dispensed to all, and was celebrated only by the bishop. But in places, such as Ireland—where the hierarchical spirit made very slow progress—many centuries elapsed before it crept into fashion. It is remarkable that it is ignored in the most ancient extant copy of the Confession of Patrick; and that a recognition of it is introduced—evidently surreptitiously—into later transcripts.[1] That the rite was imported into Ireland at a comparatively late period is apparent from the words of the celebrated Bernard, who tells us that, in the twelfth century, Malachy, Archbishop of Armagh, instituted anew among his countrymen "the sacrament of confirmation, which before they either knew not or neglected."[2] Neither had the Church of Hibernia, in the seventh century, adopted the Italian Liturgy. The Latin prayers of Rome had never yet been repeated in the hearing of an Irish congregation. There is evidence that Patrick himself conducted worship in the vernacular tongue;[3] and we know that, long after his time, there was nothing like a Book of Common Prayer in use in the island.[4] The public offices of religion were celebrated in a variety of forms; for every preacher was at liberty to offer up such confessions, thanksgivings, and supplications as he deemed most appropriate.[5] The mode of Church government in Ireland was also quite different from the polity of Rome. There were no metropolitans;[6] abbots claimed jurisdiction

---

[1] Thus the words—"et postmodum consummarentur," (*Conf.* cap. iv. 16. Villanueva's edition, Dublin 1835, p. 200), are not found in the copy in the *Book of Armagh*.

[2] Bernard's *Life of Malachy*.

[3] His celebrated hymn or prayer, said to have been first employed on his visit to King Laoghaire, and used so long afterwards in worship, is in Irish.

[4] See the old *Catalogue of Irish Saints*. Todd's *St. Patrick*, p. 88. where it is stated that, after the time of Patrick, there were different masses (or church services) and different modes of celebrating the Eucharist in Ireland. At least on one occasion the word *mass*, as employed by Adamnan, denotes simply evening prayer. See his *Life of Columbkille*. Lib. iii. *Migne*, tom. lxxxviii. 772.

[5] "Diverse rites and manners of celebrations were observed in diverse parts of this kingdom (Ireland) until the Roman use was brought in at last by Gillebertus, and Malachias, and Christianus, who were the Pope's legates here about five hundred years ago."—USSHER'S *Religion*, &c., Works, iv. 274. Elrington's edition.

[6] King's *Memoir of the Primacy of Armagh*, preface.

over bishops;[1] and whilst a bishop was ordained by a single bishop,[2] he had commonly the charge of only one congregation. It is especially noteworthy that, at this period, the authority of Scripture stood higher in Ireland than in Rome. Pope Gregory the Great had just now ventured to place the claims of the first four General Councils on a level with those of the four Evangelists;[3] but the Irish doctors paid little respect to the decisions of these Imperial Synods, and contended for the Word of God as the sole and supreme arbiter of faith and practice. The Scriptures were translated into the vulgar tongue for the use of the laity;[4] children were taught to read them;[5] and the clergy are represented as observing "only those works of piety and *chastity* which they could learn in the prophetical, evangelical, and apostolical writings."[6]

Soon after the establishment of Christianity by Constantine, the Bishop of Rome began to advance very high pretensions; but his influence was scarcely felt in Britain whilst it remained connected with the Western Empire. In the early part of the fifth century, the Roman troops withdrew finally from England; the country was then long in an unsettled condition; and, destitute of support from the Imperial power, the great Italian Prelate had not been able to assert any jurisdiction over its remote hierarchy. Under the dominion of the pagan Saxons during the fifth and sixth centuries, most of the native British Christians had retired to Wales; and meanwhile there had been comparatively little intercourse between them and their continental co-religionists. Thus it was that, when the missionaries of Pope Gregory arrived in England, they so soon came into collision with the British clergy. The ritual observances of the native Church

[1] Reeves's *Adamnan*, p. 340.

[2] Todd's *St. Patrick*, p. 74.

[3] Epist. Lib. iii. Epist. x. Opera, tom. iii. 613. Ed. Migne.

[4] See Ussher's *Religion*, &c. chap. i. Works, iv. p. 243.

[5] Ibid, p. 244. Dr. Ebrard of Erlangen has adduced various testimonies to prove that the Scriptures were translated into Irish at an early period. *Zeitschrift für historische Theologie*, 1863, p. 331.

[6] Bede, Lib. iii. chap. iv. These words supply additional evidence that the Irish Church did not attach so much importance to celibacy as the Church of Rome.

were immediately challenged as not in accordance with the arrangements of Rome; and the strangers felt aggrieved because a change was not forthwith made in obedience to their dictation.[1] The tone of arrogance assumed by these foreigners astonished and irritated the British ecclesiastics; and the parties in a short time became permanently estranged. By tokens which could not be mistaken, the native ministers signified the deep disgust with which they regarded the new comers. Nor was this antipathy of short continuance; for it appears in all its intensity after the lapse of nearly a century. "Puffed up," says one who was then an adherent of the Romish party, "with a conceit of the peculiar purity of their own conversation, they exceedingly abhor communion with us, insomuch that they will not condescend to join prayers with us in the Church, or sit at meat at the same table with us in the kindly intercourse of society. Nay, the very fragments that remain of our dishes, and what is left after our feasts, they throw out to be eaten by their gluttonous dogs and filthy swine. The vessels, too, and cups which we use, they take care to have scoured and purified, either with sandy clay from the gravel pit, or with yellow ashes from the cinders. . . . If any of our people . . . go to them for the purpose of living among them, they do not vouchsafe to admit such persons to their social fellowship till they have performed a quarantine of forty days penance."[2]

Shortly after the arrival of the Italian missionaries in South Britain, they turned their attention to the neighbouring island;

[1] The use of pictures or images in worship was now introduced into Britain by the Romish missionaries. See Bede, Book I. chap. 25. It is stated, in an old MS. that after "by the means of Austin, the Saxons became Christians, in such sort as Austin taught them, the Bryttons would not, after that, nether eate nor drinke with them, because they corrupted, with superstition, *ymages*, and *ydolatrie*, the true religion of Christ," MS. Corp. Ch. Col. Camb. quoted by Monck Mason in his "Life of Bedell," p. 38. London, 1843.

[2] *Aldhelm ad Geruntium*, Epist. I. *Patr. Curs.* tom. lxxxix. 90. Migne. Aldhelm was abbot of Malmesbury for 34 years. In A.D. 705 he was made bishop of Sherburne (now Salisbury) and died A.D. 709. He was a man of learning, and grandson of Ina, King of the West Saxons. See Murdock's *Mosheim* by Soames, ii. 90. note. The letter quoted in the text was probably written about A.D. 690. Aldhelm is said to have made a translation of the Psalms into Anglo-Saxon.

but an unfavourable account of their proceedings had already crossed the Channel; and their first attempts to introduce themselves to the Irish clergy met with a most discouraging reception. Bent, however, on extending the power of the Roman Pontiff, they soon renewed their advances; and in a letter, written about A.D. 609,[1] to the bishops or abbots of the country, they bitterly complain of unkind treatment. "When," say they, "the Apostolic See, according to the universal custom which it has followed elsewhere, sent us to these Western parts to preach to pagan nations, we came into this island which is called Britain, without possessing any previous knowledge of its inhabitants. We held both the Britons and Irish in great esteem for sanctity, believing that they had proceeded according to the custom of the universal Church; but, becoming acquainted with the errors of the Britons, we thought the Irish had been better; and yet we have been informed by bishop Dagan,[2] who has come into this island, and by Columbanus, who is an abbot in France, that the Irish in no way differ from the Britons in their behaviour; for bishop Dagan, when he came to us, not only refused to eat with us, but even to take his repast in the same house where we were entertained."[3]

Notwithstanding this unpromising commencement, the agents of Rome still continued to keep a watchful eye on the Western isle. They appear to have made themselves minutely acquainted with the state of the Irish Church, and thus at length to have discovered where they might look most hopefully for adherents. They were, of course, desirous to

---

[1] This letter was written after the death of Augustine, and when Columbanus was in France; and must therefore be dated about the period mentioned in the text. It is noteworthy that Laurentius, Mellitus, and Justus—whose names are prefixed to it—address the Irish *abbots* as *brethren*: "fratribus episcopis *vel abbatibus* per universam Scotiam." They had, no doubt, heard that the Irish abbots held a position something like that of diocesans in other countries.

[2] Dagan is said to have been educated in the monastery of Bangor, County Down.

[3] *Letter of Laurentius, Mellitus and Justus to the bishops or abbots throughout all Ireland*, Bede, ii. c. 4. Laurentius had now succeeded Augustine as Archbishop of Canterbury. Mellitus was bishop of London; and Justus, of Rochester.

enlist the support of parties who could give them effectual aid; and various influential Churchmen were induced, one after another, to listen to their overtures. When the way had been silently prepared, Pope Honorius, about A.D. 629, addressed a letter to the Irish clergy exhorting them to conform to the Roman mode of keeping Easter. This seems to have been the first Papal Epistle ever received in the Isle of Saints. It arrived at a time when it was very likely to make an impression; for the success of the foreigners in converting England from paganism was now rapidly augmenting their reputation. Only two years before, the extensive kingdom of Northumbria had been added to their missionary trophies.[1] Honorius did not pretend to say that he had any right to dictate to the Irish clergy;[2] but, assuming that they stood alone in the matter of the Paschal celebration, he dwelt on the singularity of their position; and asked them how they, living at the ends of the earth, could think themselves "wiser than all the ancient and modern Churches of Christ."[3] Soon after the receipt of this letter, a Synod was held at Magh-Lene, near Old Leighlin;[4] and the Easter question was the subject of protracted discussion. The only contemporary report we have of the proceedings has been transmitted to us by Cummian, a keen partisan, who had been won over by the Romanists; and his representations are obviously one-sided: but, withal, the truth may be eliminated from certain admissions made by this very partial witness. To a superficial reader his words may convey the impression that the members of the Synod agreed to conform to the practice of the Roman

[1] Northumbria was converted about A.D. 627.

[2] It is significant that, during all the controversy relating to Easter, the Romish party never once refer to the mission of Patrick by Celestine—a fact which they would have put in the very front of their argumentation could it have been substantiated. Honorius evidently knew nothing of any such mission.

[3] Bede, ii. c. 19.

[4] County Carlow. According to Dr. O'Conor this synod was "*convened*" by Cummian. *Hist. Address*, part ii. p. 74. Buckingham, 1812. He seems to have been the ruling spirit there. Cummian is said to have been son of the King of Desmond, and half-brother of the King of Connaught. See O'Mahony's *Keating*, 434 *note*, 478 *note*. In addition to his superior ability and learning, he thus possessed great social influence.

Church,[1] and that accordingly they sent commissioners to Italy to ascertain what was the usage in the ecclesiastical metropolis of the West; but, when all Cummian's statements are compared together, it is obvious that Rome was *only one of four* patriarchal sees to be visited by the Irish deputies. He tells us that they are to be driven out of the Church and anathematised who act in opposition "to the canonical statutes of *the four-fold apostolic see*—namely, Rome, Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria;"[2] and he acknowledges that only *some* of the commissioners repaired to the Italian capital.[3] The mission occupied nearly three years[4]—a delay which could not have occurred had Rome alone been consulted. The deputies, on their return home, announced that the Easter cycle of the Romanists was used "all over the world"[5]—thus implying that their researches had extended beyond the bounds of the Western Church. When the Hibernian strangers arrived in Rome no means seem to have been left unemployed to persuade them to conformity. They were conducted to lodgings where they found Greeks and Hebrews, Scythians and Egyptians, uniting together in observing the Paschal feast. Other arguments were used to

---

[1] To send commissioners to Rome under such circumstances would obviously have been a very nugatory proceeding, as the fact might have been ascertained with much less trouble. The Irish wished to ascertain the practice of the great apostolic churches; and a number of their deputies, perhaps on their way home from the East, spent some time in Rome.

[2] "Inveni scriptum excommunicandos et de ecclesia pellendos et anathematizandos eos qui contra statuta canonica quaternae sedis apostolicae (Romanae videlicet, Hierosolymitanae, Antiochenae, Alexandrinae) veniunt, concordantibus his in unitate Paschae."

[3] "Et ad Roman urbem *aliqui ex eis* venientes."

[4] "Tertio anno ad nos usque pervenerunt." Cummian's letter may be found in Ussher's *Sylloge*, Epist. xi., and also in *Migne*, tom. lxxxvii. 970–978.

[5] "Ante sancta sic testati sunt nobis, dicentes, '*Per totum orbem terrarum* hoc Pascha, *ut scimus*, celebratur." It would appear that, upwards of two hundred years afterwards, a similar deputation was sent out to the East from the British Isles. The Greek writers of the *Life of Chrysostom* inform us that "certain clergymen which dwelt in the isles of the ocean repaired from the utmost borders of the habitable world unto Constantinople in the days of Methodius, who was patriarch there from the year 842 to the year 847, to enquire into certain ecclesiastical traditions, and the perfect and exact computation of Easter."—Ussher's *Religion of the Irish and British*, chap. x.

convince them of the wonderful sanctity of "the see of Peter." Relics of saints were produced which were said to work miracles with astonishing facility. Some of these articles were carried over into Ireland; and the unsuspecting natives were induced to abandon their prejudices by the jugglery of pious frauds. "With our own eyes," says Cummian, "we have seen a girl quite blind opening her eyes at these relics, and a paralytic walking, and many demons cast out."[1] When the deputies returned from their travels, and when such vouchers were exhibited, no wonder that the clergy in the south of the kingdom adopted the Italian method of celebration.

The keeping of Easter is a remnant of Judaism; it is no where sanctioned in the New Testament; and it was vain to propose to determine the mode of its observance by an appeal to the Word of God. But, granting that the festival should be celebrated—an admission made by both parties in this discussion—the settlement of the time was a question, not for divines, but for astronomers or mathematicians. The cycle used at Rome was decidedly better than that employed in Ireland; and every one, possessed of sufficient learning and candour to pronounce upon the merits of the controversy, must have been constrained to acknowledge the superiority of the Italian system of computation. The discussion contributed eventually to promote the interests of the Church of Rome in Ireland; for one point, to which both sides attached much consequence, was decided in favour of the papal party; and a way was thus opened for other concessions. And yet it is obvious that there was here no appeal to the papal tribunal. The southern Irish did not yield to the letter of Pope Honorius;[2] neither did they in any way acknowledge his right to dictate to them in matters spiritual; but, believing that the most correct information as to the usages of the church catholic

[1] One of the deputies to Rome on this occasion was Laserian, Abbot of Old Leighlin. Lanigan, ii. 392, 402. He is said to have had 1,500 monks under his care. He strongly supported the Romish cycle.

[2] The same Pope Honorius held the doctrine of one will in Christ; and in the sixth General Council, held at Constantinople in A.D. 681, he was denounced as a heretic, among other Monothelites. See *Dupin*, ii. 14.

could be obtained by visiting the great cities all over Christendom in which the faith had been long professed—including, of course, the ecclesiastical metropolis of the West—they sent messengers thither to report what they saw and heard. They gave way only when assured, by witnesses of their own selection, that the practice of the Church in the East as well as in the West, was opposed to them.[1] But the abbot of Hy still refused to yield; and the churches in Scotland and Ireland under his jurisdiction persisted, for some time afterwards, in their former usage.

It has been already intimated that Cummian—the writer to whom we are indebted for much of what we know in relation to this controversy—acts the part of a special pleader, and glosses over some of the most important features of the narrative. But he was present at the Synod at Magh-Lene, as well as on other occasions when the question was discussed, so that his statements may be received as those of a primary witness; and, though he expresses himself in the spirit of a partisan, we cannot overlook the special value of his testimony. He is said to have been connected with a monastic establishment at a place in King's County which still bears his name.[2] The celebrated epistle, in which he treats of this dispute, is addressed to Segienus,[3] abbot of Hy; and it is admitted on all hands that, in dealing with the subject, he displays much ability and learning.[4] He states that he had devoted a whole year to the study of the controversy: he shows an extensive acquaintance with ecclesiastical literature; and he contends

[1] About this time the Irish Church is said to have adopted a very stringent canon relative to the observance of the Lord's Day:—"No out or in-door labour, not even sweeping or cleaning up the house: no combing: no shaving: no clipping the hair or beard: no washing the face or hands: no cutting: no sewing: no churning: no riding on horseback: no fishing: no sailing or rowing: no journeying of travellers: but wherever a man happened to be on Saturday night there was he to remain till Monday morning." O'Curry's *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Irish*, by Sullivan, vol. ii. 33. London, 1873.

[2] Kilcomin or Killcummin, *i.e.*, the Church of Cummian. See Lanigan, ii. 395.

[3] *Adamnan* calls him Seginius, and others Segeni or Segenius.

[4] The author of this Epistle is not to be confounded with Commeneus Albus, or Commian *the Fair*, the seventh Abbot of Hy, and the biographer of Columbkille. He was the person known as Cummian *Fada*, or Cummian *the Long*. He was famous for his learning. See Lanigan, ii. 398. He was exceedingly popular

with much earnestness for the adoption of the Roman cycle. He tells Segienus that the churches with which he was connected could produce no proper warrant for the method of calculation they pursued, and that they foolishly opposed themselves to the judgment of the Catholic world. "What," he exclaims, "can reflect more on our mother, the church, than to say—Rome errs, Jerusalem errs, Alexandria errs, Antioch errs, the whole world errs—the Irish and Britons alone have the wisdom to be right!"

This letter—written about A.D. 634—produced a considerable impression; and some of the northern Irish Churchmen soon exhibited a disposition to conform to the Italian mode of keeping Easter. About A.D. 639, Thomian of Armagh, and others, sought to remove their remaining scruples by entering into direct correspondence with the Bishop of Rome. Their letter reached the great city during a vacancy of the See; but John IV., the Pope elect, did not overlook the communication. His answer is addressed to "our most beloved and most holy Thomian, Columbanus, Croman, Diman, and Baithan bishops—to Croman, Hernian, Laistran, Scellan, and Segenus, presbyters—to Saran, and the rest of the Irish doctors or abbots."[1] In this epistle he replies to their inquiries; and exhorts them to beware of the errors of Pela-

---

with the papal party; and hence in an old Irish poem we have the following passage:—

"If any one went across the sea to sojourn at the seat of Gregory (Rome)—
If from Ireland he requires no more than the mention of Cumine Foda."

O'Donovan's *Four Masters*, i. 273. In the seventh century, Gregory, as the founder of the mission to England, was vastly extolled by his partizans in the British Isles. It is clear that the great services rendered at this time to the Papacy by Cummian were thoroughly appreciated at head-quarters.

[1] Bede, ii. c. 19. This letter was written towards the close of A.D. 640. According to Lanigan, Columban was the same as Colman, bishop of Clonard; and Croman, or Cronan, was bishop of Antrim; but Reeves makes him bishop of Nendrum, now Mahee Island in Strangford Lough, County Down. (*Antiq. of Down, &c.*, 10. 141; Lanigan, ii. 412-13.) Diman, or Dima, was bishop of Connor; and Baithan was perhaps bishop of some place in West Meath. The presbyter Cronan, or Croman, was abbot of Moville, in County Down; Hernian, or Ernian, was abbot of Tory Island; Laistran was abbot of Ardmac-Nasca, perhaps Holywood, near Belfast; and Segenus was abbot of Bangor. Lanigan, ii. 413-15; and Reeves's *Antiq.*, p. 273.

gianism which, as he had been informed, were making progress in Ireland.

This letter from Rome reached its destination in A.D. 641; and, shortly afterwards, many of the northern Irish clergy commenced to keep Easter according to the Italian computation. Thomian—who stands first among the churchmen to whom the letter is addressed—was bishop and abbot of Armagh for nearly thirty-eight years. He has been described as the most learned of Irishmen;[1] and the monastery over which he presided seems to have derived much of its importance from the fame of his scholarship. The part he now took in the Paschal controversy probably promoted its aggrandisement. The abbot of Iona had hitherto exercised extensive power in Ireland, for many churches and monasteries in this country were subject to his jurisdiction;[2] but about the period before us, his authority began to wane, whilst that of the abbot of Armagh was rapidly augmented. Political occurrences contributed to bring about this result. In A.D. 575, at the great convention held near Newtownlimavaddy, the king of the Scottish Dalriada, to whose territory Iona belonged, was formally released from subjection to his royal kinsman in the north of Ireland;[3] and thus, even in the time of Columbkille, one link was broken which bound his monastery to his native land. About sixty years afterwards,[4] or in A.D.

---

[1] O'Donovan's *Annals of the Four Masters*, i. 271, *note*. He is said to have presided in Armagh from A.D. 623 to A.D. 661.

[2] Columbkille is said to have founded no less than three hundred churches. Dr. Reeves has named thirty-seven churches either established by him, or in which his name was specially venerated; and he admits that the enumeration is far from complete. Among these churches may be mentioned Durrow, Derry, Kells in Meath, Drumcliff, Swords, Raphoe, Kilmore in Roscommon, Kilmacrenan, Gartan, Ballynascreen, Desertegny, Clonmany, Desertoghill, and Ballymagroarty. Reeves's *Adamnan*, 276-285.

[3] See before chap. ii., p. 36, *note* (2).

[4] See Reeves's *Adamnan*, 200-201. The battle is said to have continued seven days. It is celebrated in an ancient historical tale, entitled *The Battle of Maghrath*, translated by O'Donovan, and published by the Irish Archæological Society, in 1842. This work was probably written about the twelfth century. It is not quite certain that Maghrath is Moira, in County Down, but the battle took place not far from that locality. See Reeves's *Adamnan*, 201, *note*. According to some Maghrath is near Newry. See *Ulster Journal of Archæology*, vol. iv. 53-61.

637, the breach was widened by the desperate battle fought at Maghrath, or Moira. In that bloody struggle, the troops of the Scottish Dalriada and the Ulidians, or the men of County Down, were arrayed against the O'Neills of Ulster;[1] the confederates sustained a terrible discomfiture; but when the victory was won, the alacrity, with which the defeated Irish of Argyleshire had crossed the channel to intermeddle in the disputes of Hibernia, was not speedily forgotten. The king of Ulidia[2] was the hereditary foe of the reigning dynasty in the north of Ireland; his ancestors had themselves been possessors of the chief sovereignty; he still perhaps cherished the hope of recovering the ascendency; and therefore the help afforded him by his allies in North Britain was all the more bitterly resented. Columbkille had the sagacity to anticipate the calamity which now occurred;[3] and he had earnestly exhorted his friends in Argyleshire to beware of any dispute with his kinsmen in his native country: but, in an evil hour, his warnings were forgotten; and all the monasteries connected with Iona soon reaped a harvest of misfortunes. During the lifetime of the Apostle of the Picts, peace had been maintained between the men of Ulster and their descendants in the Scottish Dalriada; and the Hy Niall princes were most willing to honour and support their illustrious relative, the abbot of Iona. Under their auspices the institutes of his order flourished amazingly; and, had not a change of policy been inaugurated, Armagh might never have ventured to assert its claim as the ecclesiastical metropolis of Ireland. But when the great churchman passed away, and when the Hibernian kings saw a hostile monarch reigning in Argyleshire, they were no longer prepared so ardently to patronise the far-famed Scottish monastery.

---

[1] The King of Uladh seems to have been partly instigated to engage in this war "by the non-fulfilment of the promise which was made to him by the King of Ireland to put him in possession of the extended, instead of the circumscribed Uladh." Reeves's *Eccl. Antiq.*, p. 344.

[2] Before A.D. 332 Uladh, or Ulidia, was the name given to the whole province of Ulster; but subsequently it commonly denoted a territory on the eastern coast, including County Down and part of County Antrim. See *The Book of Rights*, pp. 36-7, *note*. Dublin, 1847.

[3] See *Life by Adamnan*, Lib. iii., c. 5.

It is a significant fact that Thomian of Armagh sought to remove his scruples relative to Easter, by entering into correspondence with the Pope, only two years after the battle of Maghrath. Under other circumstances he might have hesitated to adopt a course so likely to bring him into collision with the abbot of Iona; but the recent war had lowered the prestige of that dignitary; and, in all likelihood, Thomian had meanwhile ascertained that he was himself regarded with increasing favour by the royal family of Ulster. The Roman party—so desirous to secure uniformity in the keeping of the Paschal feast—were, no doubt, also anxious to set up a graduated hierarchy in Ireland; and they would not be slow to suggest to such a man as Thomian that he should be placed at the head of the Church. If he felt disposed to listen to their overtures, the blight which had just fallen on the influence of Iona removed one of the most formidable obstacles in the way of his ambition. He now certainly enjoyed a golden opportunity for extending his power; and from this period we may date the appearance of those claims which subsequently assumed a more definite form, and which at length secured a general recognition. Ingenuity could easily devise many plausible arguments in favour of the primacy of Armagh. Patrick was now dead nearly two centuries; his own *Confession*, meagre as it is in point of information, was perhaps almost the only written record of his career yet in existence; but in credulous times, traditions relating to him soon multiplied; and, out of a mass of fables, it was already very difficult, if not impossible, to gather correctly the facts of his history. He had certainly taken an interest in Armagh; in his time a church had been built in the locality; a monastery had been erected, and a friendly chieftain in the neighbourhood had endowed the establishment with some valuable landed property;[1] but there is no substantial evidence that the Apostle of Ireland was in any way more closely connected with it than with many other places which had enjoyed the benefits of his ministry. It is even questionable whether he ever resided there for any considerable period. It is probable

[1] See Todd's *St. Patrick*, 472, 473, 479.

that his namesake, "Patrick of the Prayers, who had good Latin,"[1] was the first teacher in its seminary. If any spot was entitled to peculiar reputation as associated with the triumphs and the trials of the great missionary, the distinction was due unquestionably, not to Armagh, but to Downpatrick. There Patrick had gained his first Irish converts; there his first Irish church was to be seen;[2] there he had fixed his residence in his declining years; and there, according to universal tradition, his body was buried.[3] Had the king of Ulidia been king of Ireland, his capital Downpatrick would have been assuredly acknowledged as the seat of the Hibernian primacy. But the lord of the territory with which Patrick had been so closely identified happened to be a petty sovereign, the head of a declining dynasty, regarded with dislike and jealousy by the chief monarch of the country. Downpatrick could not, therefore, enjoy the honour which it might have otherwise inherited. Nor was the enfeebled condition of its civil ruler the only disadvantage with which it had to contend. It had no renowned monastic seminary[4] to maintain and extend its influence; and as yet, with one exception,[5] its bishops seem to have been persons of little importance or ability. It was otherwise with Armagh. Its literary institute was already held in high repute, and Thomian had added to its celebrity. It so happened that its abbots had always been men of mark and influence. Some of the earliest of these abbots were scions of one of the great families of Ulster;

[1] See O'Donovan's *Annals of the Four Masters*, at A.D. 448. See also *The Old Catholic Church*, pp. 315-6.

[2] The name of Patrick's first Irish convert is said to have been Dichu or Dicho. The remains of Saul Abbey, the place where Patrick's first church stood, are at a short distance from Downpatrick. Lanigan, i. 212; Harris, *County Down*, 40. *Saul* (in Irish Sabhall) signifies *a barn*, because Patrick's first church is reported to have been previously Dichu's barn.

[3] See Todd's *St. Patrick*, p. 490.

[4] There is said to have been, at a very early period, a seminary at Downpatrick (See O'Mahony's *Keating*, p. 500); but it was never so distinguished as some others.

[5] The *Annals of the Four Masters*, at A.D. 583, mention the death of Fergus, bishop of Downpatrick; but, for upwards of 160 years afterwards, we hear nothing of his successors. See Reeves's *Antiq.*, p. 144. Fergus is said to have been of high birth.

under their auspices accessions had probably been made to the possessions of the Church; and their position presented such secular attractions that it was sought after by the sons of the aristocracy.[1] The first abbot of Iona nominated his successor;[2] and, if the early abbots of Armagh exercised the same privilege, we can explain how it was that they were all of noble lineage.[3] It is well known that, hundreds of years after the time of Patrick, the See was claimed exclusively by a particular family.[4]

The stories invented to prop up the pretensions of Armagh may well remind us of the fables which sustain the primacy of Rome. In opposition to the testimony even of the Word of God,[5] the papal advocates assert that Peter was the Prince of the Apostles, that he was bishop of Rome for five-and-twenty years, and that he bequeathed an inheritance of supremacy to the Popes, his successors. Our Lord said to the apostle of the circumcision, "Thou art Peter (or a stone); and on *this rock* will I build my Church."[6] The Church is built on the confession of Peter—on the eternal truth to which he testified, on the doctrine that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, the Rock of Ages. Romanists absurdly affirm that it rests on the bishop of the old metropolis of Italy. Those interested in promoting the pre-eminence of the Church of Armagh, were obliged to resort to equally puerile arguments in support of its claims. They told how Patrick had been instructed by an angel to bestow on it the chief honour.[7] The

[1] Thus we read in the *Annals of the Four Masters*:—

"A.D. 525, Ailill, bishop of Armagh, who was of the Ui-Breasail, died;

A.D. 535, Oilill, bishop of Armagh, died. He was also of the Ui-Breasail."

The family of the Ui-Breasail derived its name from Breasail, a descendant of Colla Dachrich, one of the northern princes, who was grandson of Cairbre Lifeachar, monarch of Ireland. See O'Donovan's *Four Masters*, i. 173, and Connellan's *Four Masters*, p. 2.

[2] Reeves's *Adamnan*, p. 342.

[3] They were, "for many generations, lineal descendants of the family from which the original endowment in land had been derived." Todd's *St. Patrick*, p. 155.

[4] See Bernard's *Life of Malachy*, chap. x.

[5] Mat. xx. 25-28; Luke xxii. 24-26; 1. Pet. v. 1-3.

[6] Mat. xvi. 18.

[7] "That city, indeed, was constituted free and *the chief* by the angel of God,

saint, they alleged, was most desirous to die in Armagh; and, when he recognised the signs of approaching dissolution, actually set out to go there; but an angel again interposed, and commanded him to return to Saul or Downpatrick.[1] To console him under this disappointment, he was assured, by special revelation, that certain things he had prayed for had been granted; and, among the rest, that "his jurisdiction" was to have "its seat" in the place where he was not permitted to finish his career.[2] The men of Armagh, they affirmed farther, were anxious to obtain possession of his body that it might be buried in their country; but the men of Down resisted; and a civil war would have ensued had not some peaceful spirits contrived to settle the dispute by a compromise. The body was placed on a bier; two untamed oxen were yoked to it; and it was agreed that, wherever the cattle stopped spontaneously, there the sacred remains should be interred. The two parties followed the bier, which seemed, by a strange illusion, to carry the body into their respective territories. When the Armagh men approached a river near their city, the bier and oxen vanished; and thus, they say, Patrick was like Moses; for no one could tell where he was buried.[3] In this way the partizans of Armagh endeavoured to discredit the fact that Downpatrick was the place of his sepulture.

Armagh was classic ground; for in its immediate neighbourhood had stood the palace of Emania, where, according to tradition, Hibernian kings had lived in rude splendour for centuries.[4] And there too, in the days of Cuchullin and

and especially granted to that apostolic man, Patrick the Bishop."—*Book of Armagh*, Betham's *Irish Antiq. Researches*, part ii. 411.

[1] *Book of Armagh*, Betham, ii. 339. [2] Todd's *St. Patrick*, p. 490.

[3] "In four points," says the *Book of Armagh* (Betham, ii. 387), "Patrick resembled Moses:—1st. He heard an angel from a bush on fire; 2nd. He fasted forty days and forty nights; 3rd. Because he accomplished 120 years in this present life; 4th. Where his bones are no one knows." All these statements are apocryphal, and yet they must have been current in the eighth century, as the existing copy of the *Book of Armagh* was written early in the ninth. In the twelfth century it was alleged that Patrick was buried in Armagh. Bernard says of it:—"Sedes illa, in qua et vivens praefuit, et mortuus requiescit."—*Life of Malachy*, chap. x.

[4] It was destroyed in A.D. 332, according to the *Annals of Tighernach*. Armagh,

Conall the Victorious, if we credit the Irish annalists, the Red Branch Knights of Ulster,[1] so famous for their prowess, had often assembled on parade, and mustered in their strength before they issued forth to face the hurricane of battle. When a monastery was built there, and when a churchman of noble blood was placed over the establishment, its glory partially revived; as it derived a species of reflected lustre from ancient associations. Its fame as an educational institute attracted crowds of students. If the abbot of Armagh, like the abbot of Iona, exercised supervision in after life over those trained for the ministry in his seminary, he must soon have acquired extensive jurisdiction; and his adherents would be inclined to give credence to tales circulated with a view to increase his reputation. If it could indeed have been shown that Armagh was really the place which the great Hibernian missionary delighted to honour, it would have been fairly entitled to take precedence; for Columbkille himself might be regarded as one of the fruits of the ministry of Patrick; and, in the roll of ecclesiastical worthies, the Apostle of the Northern Picts could not be assigned so high a position as the Apostle of Ireland. But, in the sixth century, the bishopric, or abbey, over which Thomian presided during the heat of the Easter controversy, made no such pretensions as it afterwards advanced. During the whole of the seventh century the disciples of Hy recognised no superiority on the part of the disciples of Armagh; for they knew that Columbkille, in his day, had occupied a position inferior to that of no other Irish churchman. He appears to have considered that he was himself the most fitting representative of the great Hibernian evangelist.[2] When Thomian and his adherents in the North

---

or *Ard-Macha*, means Macha's height or hill. Queen Macha is said to have founded Emania. *King's Memoir*, p. 68.

[1] See Connellan's *Four Masters*, p. 413. They are said to have had "devices of Red Branches on their banners," and to have flourished from the first to the fourth century of our era.

[2] The following curious entry occurs in the *Annals of Ulster*, at A.D. 552:—"I have found what follows in the *Book of Cuanach*. The relics of St. Patrick were deposited in a shrine sixty years after his death by Columbkille. Three precious swearing relics were found in his tomb, to wit, the Koach, the Gospel of the Angel,

began to celebrate Easter after the Romish fashion, they assumed an attitude which provoked and mortified the adherents of Iona.[1] About this time Armagh commenced to claim that precedence which the current of events enabled it to maintain. But it did not succeed in securing the recognition of its superiority until after many a bitter struggle. The Easter controversy intensified party spirit; and ecclesiastical jealousies sometimes broke out into open violence. The monks of Armagh and the monks of Iona divided the country into factions; and even those who endeavoured to mediate between the disputants incurred no little hazard. "A third party," says an old annalist, "did not agree with the followers of Patrick or with the followers of Columbkille, so that the clergy of Erin used to hold many Synods; and these clergy used to come to the Synods accompanied by the laity,[2] so that battles and deaths occurred between them."[3]

Whilst the Easter controversy kept men's minds in a state of excitement, the contending parties sought to strengthen their respective interests by their interpretations of the dispensations of Providence. We cannot think it strange that the calamities which now befell the nation, and which were of almost unparalleled severity, were regarded as signs of divine displeasure.[4] They are said to have been ushered in by a

---

and the Bell of the Will. The angel thus showed to Columbkille how to divide these relics, namely, the Koach to Down, the Bell of the Will to Armagh, and the Gospel of the Angel to Columbkille himself; and it is called the Gospel of the Angel because Columbkille received it at the angel's hand." The Koach is said to have been St. Patrick's cup. This story is evidently a miserable legend; but it shows that, in the estimation of the narrator, Columbkille was the chief heir of St. Patrick, as he inherited the most precious relic—the Gospel of the Angel. *Journal of Archæology*, vol. iv. 53-61.

[1] This jealousy on the part of the monks of Iona may account for the fact that Patrick is only once mentioned by Adamnan in his *Life of Columbkille*. In the sixth century the monastery of Kildare stood as high as the monastery of Armagh. Condlaed, the bishop appointed by Brigid, is described as "the anointed head *and chief of all bishops*." See Todd's *St. Patrick*, p. 12.

[2] In these days the Irish laity were freely permitted to be present at the deliberations of the clergy. In some cases the King presided over the Synod. See O'Mahony's *Keating*, p. 405, *note*.

[3] *Fragments of Irish Annals* at A.D. 704, p. 113, published by the *Irish Archæological and Celtic Society*, Dublin 1860.

[4] In *Fragments* (Mac Firbis) *of Irish Annals*, p. 113, where there is an account,

remarkable eclipse of the sun[1]—a phenomenon then deemed ominous of approaching disasters. A terrible disease—known as "the yellow plague,"[2] which had appeared in Ireland about the middle of the sixth century—now broke out again with augmented virulence; and proved so fatal that, according to some accounts, it swept away two-thirds[3] of the population.

---

as already quoted, of the contentions about Easter, it is added: "Many evils resulted in Erin in consequence of this, viz., a great murrain of cows, and a very great famine, and many diseases, and the devastation of Erin by foreign hordes."

[1] This eclipse occurred on the 1st of May, A.D. 664. O'Donovan's *Four Masters*, i. 277, *note*.

[2] In the *Annals of the Four Masters*, it is noticed as occurring in A.D. 543, and re-appearing in A.D. 664. It was called the Yellow Plague from the colour which it imparted to the body. It seems to have been a species of jaundice.

[3] The assertion of Professor Sullivan (Introduction to O'Curry's *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Irish*, i. xvii.) that "in the sixth and seventh centuries" the population of Ireland was "about three millions," has not even the appearance of probability. It must be rejected for the following reasons among others. 1. According to those who possessed the best means of information, the population even in the reign of Elizabeth did not exceed 600,000. See proofs afterwards given. 2. In the seventh century a great part of the country was covered with woods and bogs; it could not have sustained anything like a population of three millions. In the beginning of the reign of James I, there was so little tillage that the corn was exhausted at Christmas. See Fynes Moryson's *History of Ireland*, ii. 375, Dublin, 1755. 3. In the sixth and seventh centuries pestilence and famine repeatedly thinned the population. 4. There were then no towns of any large size in the country. 5. The prevalence of monachism checked the growth of the population. 6. The tuaths, or territories, into which Ireland was divided do not appear at any time to have much exceeded 184; they were at one time not nearly so numerous; and no tuath was required to furnish more than 700 soldiers. But the conscription was so close at this period that women, monks, and clergy, were obliged to march to the battle field. Mere boys were among the conscripts; and those engaged in these hostings were probably not less than the one-fourth of the whole population. But even supposing that every tuath all over the country could send 700 combatants into the field, and that there were 184 in all—the whole would have amounted only to 128,800, representing a population of little more than half a million. We do not read in any authentic history that there were any great armies in ancient Ireland. In one of the greatest battles on record, fought in A.D. 709, there were present in all, on both sides, only 30,000 combatants. O'Mahony's *Keating*, 484. 7. The population was thinned by the almost perpetual wars of the petty chieftains. These reasons are surely more than sufficient to prove that the population of Ireland in the sixth and seventh centuries could not have been as large as in the eighteenth. It is much more probable that it did not exceed half a million—and very likely that it was not so much. Had it contained such a population as Professor Sullivan ascribes to it, the petty King of Northumbria would not have ventured to invade it.

The country of the Northern Picts escaped the scourge; and, as the great monastery of Iona was there, multitudes believed that the exemption was to be attributed to the intercession of Columbkille.[1] We can well imagine that such an impression helped to fortify the resolution of those who were not disposed to adopt the Roman mode of keeping Easter.

The Yellow Plague formed only a part of the sufferings of the people of Ireland. We may, indeed, hesitate to believe all that is recorded of this period by the native annalists[2]—as, for instance, when they tell us how in A.D. 684 "there was a great frost, so that the lakes and rivers were frozen; and the sea between Ireland and Scotland was frozen, so that there was a communication between them on the ice!"[3]—a statement which turns to scorn all the calculations of geologists as to the prodigious antiquity of the glacial era.[4] Neither are we bound to credit another of their depositions that, about the same time, "there was a mortality upon all animals, throughout the whole world, for the space of three

---

[1] Adamnan, in *Life of Columbkille*, expressly ascribes the exemption to this cause. Lib. ii., c. 46; but as that work was written after his visit to the Court of Northumbria—where he changed his views on the Easter question—we may presume that he did not interpret the Providence exactly in the same way as many of his co-religionists.

[2] It is right to state that the Irish annals relating to this period are not entitled to much credit as historical authorities. The earliest of the annalists flourished in the eleventh century. The *Annals of the Four Masters* were compiled in the seventeenth century. The annalists, no doubt, were supplied with materials by preceding writers; but they often exhibit great credulity, much want of candour, and a sad lack of critical sagacity.

[3] O'Donovan's *Annals of the Four Masters*, ii. 291. (*Chronicum Scotorum*, p. 113.) The annals about this time record other extraordinary occurrences. Thus at A.D. 690 we are told of a shower of blood in Leinster, and of a wolf speaking with human voice. O'Donovan's *Four Masters*, i. 295-297. As to the showers of blood, of which we often read, see Rees's *Cyclopedia*, art. RAIN.

[4] The Irish annalists profess to tell the dates at which the rivers and lakes of the country first appeared. See *Chronicum Scotorum*, p. 7. London, 1866. But they account for them in a way very different from the theory of Sir Charles Lyell:—"That Lough Neagh was indeed formed by an *inundation*, . . . and that this inundation actually took place in the first century [of the Christian era], *there is no reason to doubt*, because it is recorded by the most ancient and trustworthy of our annalists, and the names of the very tribes *who occupied the plain so covered*, are also given in very ancient documents."—PETRIE'S *Ecclesiastical Architecture of Ireland*, p. 45. Dublin, 1845

years, so that there escaped not *one out of the thousand* of any kind of animals,"[1]—as the history of all nations attests that this is a monstrous exaggeration. But the amount of actual affliction in Ireland was so great that all classes were exceedingly disheartened. A mysterious blight rendered the fruit trees barren;[2] a cattle plague destroyed a large portion of the means of subsistence;[3] a famine supervened; and an earthquake added to the general consternation.[4] In A.D. 684, Egfrid, king of Northumbria, sent an invading army into Ireland. His elder brother Alfrid, who was an aspirant to his throne, but who laboured under the taint of illegitimacy,[5] had, it appears, retired to this island; and Egfrid resolved to wreak vengeance on those who had given him an asylum. The invaders appeared in Bregia—a territory between Drogheda and Dublin—spread terror all around them; destroyed churches and monasteries; made slaves of not a few of the inhabitants; and returned with great booty into England. Egfrid did not long survive this expedition;[6] his brother—so much the object of his jealousy—succeeded him on the throne; and Adamnan, the biographer of Columbkille, and now abbot of Iona—who had made the acquaintance of the new monarch when the prince resided in an Irish monastery during the period of his exile—was deputed to repair to the Northumbrian court, and solicit the release of the Hibernian bondsmen. Adamnan gained great credit by this mission, as it proved completely successful. He was honourably received by his friend king Alfrid, and appeared in Ireland soon afterwards, accompanied by no less than sixty liberated captives.[7]

---

[1] *Annals of the Four Masters*, at A.D. 684.

[2] Reeves's *Adamnan*. Appendix to preface, liii.

[3] Mac Firbis's *Annals*, p. 113.

[4] This earthquake is mentioned in the *Annals of Ulster*, at A.D. 684, and in the *Annals of Clonmacnois*, at A.D. 680. See O'Donovan's *Four Masters*, i. 3.

[5] William of Malmesbury's *Chronicle*, i. 3.

[6] He was killed in the following year, *i.e.* A.D. 685, in the great battle fought at Nechtans-mere, or Dunnichen, between the Northumbrians and the Picts. On this occasion the Northumbrians were completely routed, and the independence of Pictland preserved. See Burton's *History of Scotland*, i. 312.

[7] Reeves's *Adamnan*. Preface, xlvi.

Adamnan was abbot of Hy for a quarter of a century;[1] and was much respected for his piety and learning. His influence with his own fraternity was greatly diminished immediately after his return from the court of Northumbria. He was there brought to see the superiority of the Roman cycle for the calculation of Easter; but he laboured in vain to persuade the brotherhood at Iona to share his convictions. Their refusal to give way to him at length rendered his position so uncomfortable that he withdrew from the monastery in the early part of A.D. 697, and spent seven years in Ireland, his native land.[2] He meanwhile neglected no opportunity of recommending the new style of Easter celebration to all parties in Ulster.[3] He did not return to Iona until shortly before his death in A.D. 704.

Adamnan had rendered an important service to his country by his successful appeal to king Alfrid for the release of the Irish captives; but he was ill requited by the reigning sovereign.[4] The island was then divided into two parts—known as *Leath Cuinn* and *Leath Mogha*,[5] or the Northern Half and the Southern Half—separated by an imaginary line passing across the country from Dublin to Galway. Over these two sections the Northern and Southern Hy Nialls

[1] That is from A.D. 679 to A.D. 704. He was born about A.D. 624 in the barony of Tirhugh, County Donegal; and was of the race of the Northern Hy Nialls. In the selection of the abbots of Iona a preference was always given to the founder's kin; and hence, of the eleven abbots who immediately succeeded Columbkille, there is but one confessedly of another family. Reeves's *Adamnan*, p. 342.

[2] That is from A.D. 697 to A.D. 704.

[3] Bede says:—"He reduced very many of them, and almost all who were not under the dominion of those in Hy, to the Catholic unity." v. 15.

[4] His treatment was all the worse if, as Dr. Reeves suggests, he undertook the mission "at the instance of King Finnachta, on whose patrimonial territory the descent had been made by the Saxons."—REEVES's *Adamnan*. Appendix to preface, xlv.

[5] In Irish, *Leath* signifies the half, or a moiety. It is said that, some time in the second century, Cuinn—known as Conn of the Hundred Battles—and Mogha, King of Munster, agreed to divide the sovereignty of Ireland between them, according to the arrangement mentioned in the text. Hence the Northern portion—including the ancient kingdoms of Leinster, Ulster, and Connaught—was called Leath Cuinn; and the Southern portion—including the ancient kingdoms of Leinster and Munster—was known as Leath Mogha. Connellan's *Four Masters*, 146, 267.

ruled; and their contentions kept the whole kingdom in a state of almost perpetual disquietude. The early abbots of Iona were allied by blood to the Northern family; and though the offensive attitude assumed by the Scottish Dalriada at the battle of Maghrath was bitterly remembered, it was well known that Columbkille had long before warned them of the danger of the course they had pursued;[1] and there was reason to believe that his successors in the abbatial office disapproved of the proceeding. But about this time the glory of the Northern Hy Nialls was sadly tarnished. In A.D. 675 Finnachta Fledach, of the Southern family, became chief monarch of Ireland; and, in the following year, Aileach, near Derry, the stronghold and palace of the Northern Kings,[2] was reduced to ruins. This revolution had an influence on the ecclesiastical controversies, then agitating Ireland. The Southerns had, long before, adopted the Roman mode of keeping Easter; and Finnachta viewed with impatience the obstinate non-conformity of the churches and monasteries connected with Iona. Acting under this impulse, he issued a proclamation to the effect that "the lands of Columbkille should not enjoy the same privileges as those of Patrick, Finnian, and Ciaran."[3] The monasteries of Armagh, Clonard, and Clonmacnois, are here described respectively by the names of their founders; and it would thus appear that, towards the close of the seventh century, the property attached to these establishments enjoyed an immunity from taxation denied to the possessions of Hy. Armagh reaped special advantages from the arrangement, as it was placed by the royal ordinance above its most formidable rival. Adamnan is said to have been so provoked by this proclamation, that he pronounced a curse on the hated lawgiver. The old

[1] See Reeves's *Adamnan*, 200, 201.

[2] In Ennishowen, County Donegal. For an account of this ancient seat of Irish royalty see *Ordnance Survey of the County of Londonderry*, p. 234. See also Reeves's *Adamnan*. Appendix to preface, xliii. *note*. Finnachta was chief monarch of Ireland from A.D. 675 to A.D. 695. He was killed by his cousin. Reeves's *Adamnan*. Appendix to pref. xlix. At the intercession of Moling, a Leinster ecclesiastic of great celebrity, he released the Leinster men from what was called the Borumha, or cattle tribute, long paid by them to the chief of the reigning family. *Ibid.*

[3] Reeves's *Adamnan*. Appendix to preface, xlix.

Irish saints, according to the accounts handed down to us, must have been exceedingly irascible;[1] and quite too apt to forget the admonition, "Bless, and curse not."[2] Adamnan, on the present occasion, certainly exhibited this infirmity.

In the beginning of the seventh century, when Laurentius, Archbishop of Canterbury, with his brother prelates, Mellitus and Justus, recently arrived from Rome, addressed a letter to "the bishops or abbots throughout all Ireland,"[3] the foreign missionaries were apparently not aware that any one of these bishops or abbots claimed jurisdiction over the rest—for, in that case, they would in some way have distinguished the superior dignitary. Twenty years later, when Pope Honorius sent an epistle to the Irish clergy in which he remonstrated with them for their non-conformity as to the mode of keeping Easter, he also evidently did not know that any one among them possessed primatial authority. Soon after the receipt of his communication,[4] we have seen that the Southern bishops and abbots held a Synod, in which they discussed the subject thus brought before them; and, in coming to a decision, they were apparently guided by the votes of the majority of the assembly. Without consulting their Northern brethren, they commenced to keep Easter after the Roman fashion. Several years afterwards, when Thomian of Armagh, Colman of Clonard, Diman of Connor, and others, entered into correspondence with the bishop of Rome, it is certain that none of them occupied the position of a metropolitan. Thomian is, indeed, named first in the superscription of the reply sent to them by the Pope Elect; but this fact admits of the obvious explanation that, as the prime mover in the affair, he had been the first to sign the previous communication. As he was, perhaps, the most eminent scholar among his countrymen, as he was a landed proprietor of some importance, and as all the clergy trained in his seminary recognised him as their ecclesiastical chief, he must have occupied a position of no little influence.

---

[1] Reeves's *Adamnan*. Appendix to preface, lxxvii.

[2] Rom. xii. 14.

[3] See the preceding part of this chapter, p. 62, *note* (1).

[4] See Lanigan, ii. 389; and Bede, ii. 19.

About this time monks from England, zealous for the extension of the Italian forms of worship, began to visit the Irish monasteries; and the aversion with which they had been formerly regarded gradually disappeared. Instead of being excluded from fellowship at meals, they were received with favour wherever the new Easter cycle was adopted. They did not neglect to commend the Church of Rome; to boast of its greatness, its antiquity, and its soundness in the faith; to plead for the authority of the Pope; and to extol him as the centre of catholic unity. These representations, repeated with great boldness from time to time, could not fail, in the end, to make an impression; and though, in polity and worship, the Irish Church still continued to differ much from the Church of Rome, a respect for the Italian See silently gained ground, and there was a growing disposition to defer to pontifical authority.

Some of the Irish churchmen who took the lead in endeavouring to persuade their countrymen to adopt the Italian mode of keeping Easter, signalized themselves by their zeal for additional conformity. There is pretty clear evidence that Cummian—the author of the famous Paschal Epistle already mentioned—was the most noted of these Romanizers. We have seen that he was not particularly candid in stating facts; neither was he very courteous in his treatment of those who ventured to dispute his sentiments.[1] But his erudition was generally admitted; he was highly flattered by the friends of the papacy; and, according to one version of an old poem in the native language, he was even encouraged to aspire to the chair of Peter.[2] He unquestionably did more than any of his

[1] Thus, one of the members of the synod of Magh-Lene, who differed from him on the question of Easter, but whose suggestion, as he himself admits, was adopted by that assembly, is styled by him—"paries dealbatus"—a whited wall, or, in other words, a hypocrite. See his *Paschal Epist.*, Migne, tom. lxxxvii. 977.

[2] One version of this passage has been already given, p. 67, *note* (4); but the following is the translation adopted in the *Book of Hymns* (Part i., p. 86), published by the Irish Archæological and Celtic Society:—

> "If any one went across the sea
> To sit in the chair of Gregory,
> If from Ireland, it was not meet for him,
> Except he was Cummine Fota."

contemporaries to accommodate the differences between the Church of Rome and the Church of Ireland. A Penitential written by him—a kind of manual in which sins are classified and estimated—has reached our times;[1] and this production attests at once his intensely ritualistic spirit, and his desire to secure respect for Italian usages. He here declares that the man who contemns "the custom of the Romans" is to be put out of the Church as a heretic."[2] Though for the greater part of his life he had been himself a nonconformist,[3] he evinces little charity for those who could not so readily change their habits and their principles. "If any one," says he, "despises the Council of Nice, and celebrates Easter with the Jews on the fourteenth day of the moon, let him be cut off from every church."[4] Some of his judgments reveal a disposition to deal very gently with the offences of zealous churchmen. If a clergyman were found in a state of beastly intoxication, he was required to undergo a forty days penance; but if he happened to get drunk on a Church festival, and if he had not exceeded the quantity of liquor—whatever that might be—allowed him by his ghostly fathers, he was taught that he had done no harm.[5] At that time it was nothing unusual to meet with ecclesiastics who were married; and, in such cases, Cummian did not propose either to pronounce their ordination void, or to dissolve the ties of wedlock; but, unmindful of the ordinance—"what God hath joined together, let not man put asunder"[6]—he declares that the clergyman

[1] It may be found in Migne, *Patr. Cursus*, tom. lxxxvii. 979-98.

[2] "Pro damnatione Ecclesiae Catholicae et consuetudinis Romanorum, projiciatur ab ecclesia sicut haereticus." See Moran's *Essays on the Early Irish Church*, p. 260.

[3] He was born, it would appear, about A.D. 589, and died, aged 72, in A.D. 661. See *Book of Hymns*, Part i., p. 84. Dublin, 1855. Like many of the other early Irish saints he was of illegitimate birth. He is said to have been bishop of Clonfert, *Ibid.* pp. 92, 93.

[4] Caput, xi.

[5] "Si vero per infirmitatem, aut qui longo tempore se abstinuerit, et in consuetudine non erat ei multum bibere, vel manducare, aut pro gaudio in Natali Domini, aut in Pascha, aut pro alicujus sanctorum commemoratione faciebat, et tunc plus non accepit quam decretum est a senioribus, *nihil nocet*." Caput, i.

[6] Mat. xix. 6.

who lives, as a husband, with his wife is guilty of adultery.[1] It is clear that, in his days, the practice of making confession to the officiating minister before partaking of the Eucharist was not unknown in the country; but it is equally plain that it was not, in all cases, considered obligatory; for even Cummian acknowledges the sufficiency of confession to God alone.[2] This Penitential presents a melancholy picture of the state of morals in Ireland in the seventh century; as it enters, with painful minuteness, into an enumeration of crimes which could be expected to recur only among a population sunk in the lowest depths of ignorance and barbarism. We must not suppose that the prurient fancy of the Penitentiary has invented so many forms of transgression.

When calling attention to the circumstances contributing to advance the interests of the Church of Rome in Ireland, we are bound to notice the Lives of Patrick which began, about the close of the seventh century, to make their appearance. These Lives bear abundant evidences of their monkish origin. They exhibit such credulity, such a want of common sense, such chronological blundering,[3] and such recklessness of assertion, that they are nearly worthless as historical documents. They are all evidently written in the interest of Armagh, and their authors apparently looked on the most barefaced falsehoods with indulgence, when they were likely to promote what they deemed the good of the Church.[4] It is admitted, in one of the very earliest of these productions, that, at the time when it was composed, the sources from which information was to be gleaned were "of uncertain

---

[1] "Clericus vel superioris gradus qui uxorem habuit, et praeter professionem suam, vel honorem clericatus, iteratus eam cognoverit, sciat se sibi adulterium commisisse." Caput, iii.

[2] "Confessio autem Deo soli ut agatur, si necesse est, licebit." Caput. xiv.

[3] Thus, in the *Book of Armagh* (Betham, ii. 416), it is stated that "between Saint Patrick of the Irish, and Bridget and Columba a friendship of love took place,"—though Columbkille was not born until one or two generations had passed away after the death of Patrick.

[4] In one of these (*The Tripartite*) Patrick himself is represented as going to Rome and there stealing a quantity of relics—including a towel stained with Christ's blood and some of the hair of Mary—to be deposited at Armagh. See Todd's *St. Patrick*, p. 481.

authority," and that the subject was one of extreme difficulty by reason of the "diverse opinions" which prevailed in relation to Patrick, and the "numerous doubts" afloat respecting him;[1] but, instead of carefully sifting these materials, by the application of sober and searching criticism, the most palpable misstatements were permitted to pass unchallenged, and the most puerile tales were related with the utmost gravity. The convenient discovery was now made that Palladius—the missionary sent by Pope Celestine into Ireland—was also called Patrick;[2] the acts of this individual and of the real Irish apostle were jumbled together: "Patrick of the prayers who had good Latin" was confounded with the author of the *Confession;* and thus three single gentlemen were verily rolled into one. The result of this manipulation was that a Life was produced in which Patrick was represented as having studied many years, first under Martin of Tours, and then under Germanus of Auxerre[3]—as having reached threescore before he commenced his missionary career in Ireland—as having been commissioned by Pope Celestine to prosecute his labours in this country—as having fixed the seat of his Primacy at Armagh—and as having died at the patriarchal age of one hundred and twenty.[4] As time rolled on, legend after legend was added to this framework of fiction; and, at length, in the twelfth century, Jocelin wrote a biography of the saint—at present perhaps the best known to English

[1] These are the statements of Muirchu Maccumachtheni in his preface to the most ancient memoir of Patrick in the *Book of Armagh*. The hymn of Fiacc—by some supposed to have been written shortly after the death of Patrick—is probably not of an earlier date than the close of the seventh century. It sanctions silly tales of late origin. It also refers twice to the desertion of the Palace of Tara, which took place after A.D. 565, and which was apparently then not a recent occurrrence. See Todd's *St. Patrick*, p. 313, and 489, *note*.

[2] Thus we read in the *Book of Armagh* :—"Palladius, the bishop, was the first sent, *who is otherwise called Patrick*." Betham, ii. 388.

[3] See before, chap. i., pp. 16, 17.

[4] It was known from Prosper that Palladius was sent into Ireland by Pope Celestine, in A.D. 431. It was also known that Patrick had laboured sixty years in Ireland. Hence, to reconcile the various statements relative to the great Irish missionary with the allegation that he was sent into the country by Celestine after the death of Palladius, the story was concocted that he died at the age of one hundred and twenty towards the close of the fifth century.

readers[1]—which, by its absurdity and extravagance, has made the memory of Patrick ridiculous.

Antiquaries have indulged in various speculations as to the Liturgy used in Ireland by Patrick and his immediate successors. The statements bearing on this subject, to be met with in writers of later times, possess little intrinsic value; as they are, in general, merely the opinions, or it may be, the misconceptions of their ill-informed authors. Before the establishment of Christianity by Constantine, the reading of a liturgy was a practice unknown in any part of the Church;[2] and, though forms of prayer were current at the time when Patrick appeared in Ireland, there was not, either in the East or West, anything like uniformity in the public devotional services.[3] Worship was still conducted everywhere in the language understood by the people;[4] and the idea that Patrick, when acting as a missionary in this country, confined himself to what is now known as the *Cursus Scottorum*, or any other Latin form of prayer, is simply preposterous. His own hymn or prayer—which was afterwards in general use throughout the island, and which is still extant in the most ancient dialect of the native tongue—is a sufficient answer to any such hypothesis. The Hibernian apostle himself intimates that his long and constant use of Irish had almost disqualified him for writing his *Confession*, as he was obliged to translate his thoughts into a foreign language[5]—an apology he could not have well urged had he been all along accustomed to a Latin ritual. But Latin, at an early period, became the vehicle for correspondence among churchmen all over the West; it was the tongue of the learned; and, as the Irish ecclesiastical establishments were schools where it was taught, it is not improbable that it was soon employed there as the language of monastic devotion. We may presume, however, that the forms of prayer which were in use, were

---

[1] A translation into English of this work by Swift appeared in 1809.

[2] Palmer's *Origines Liturgicae*, i. 9, 121; Bingham, iv. 187.

[3] *Mosheim* by Reid, p. 154. London, 1848.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 234.

[5] "Nam sermo et loquela nostra translata est *in linguam alienam*." *Confession*, cap. i. § 3.

rehearsed, according to circumstances, either in Irish or in Latin;[1] and it is not improbable that, in certain cases, they were repeated in both. It is quite certain that, long after the seventh century, prayers and litanies in the vernacular tongue were heard in Irish congregations.[2]

The intercourse with the adherents of Rome, which was carried on with increasing cordiality after the settlement of the Easter question, did not tend to elevate the character of the Church of the Emerald Isle. From this time new forms of superstition begin to make their appearance. The doctrine of Purgatory had before been unknown[3] in Ireland; but when Hibernian doctors were led to admire Pope Gregory the Great, it was to be expected that they would soon adopt the dogma which he so vigorously maintained. Adamnan tells us, in his *Life of Columbkille*, how much importance was attached by his contemporaries to that good man's prayers; and how, when he was abbot of Iona, persons in danger or distress sought his intercession;[4] but the biographer himself goes a step farther, and sanctions the invocation of saints departed.[5] These prayers to the dead were now quite common. In an old Irish hymn, recently published for the

[1] Thus, in some very old manuscripts, we have the Lord's Prayer in Latin and Irish—a clause in Latin being immediately followed by its translation in Irish. See Moran's *Essays on the Early Irish Church*, p. 247. Dublin, 1864. In like manner, in the *Yellow Book of Lecain*, we have a litany, said to have been used by Aileran of Clonard, who died A.D. 664, in Latin and Irish. See O'Curry's *Lectures*, p. 378.

[2] Thus, among the original *Irish* tracts in the *Leabhar Breac*—the oldest and best Irish MS. relating to our church history now preserved—are "ancient copies and expositions of the Lord's Prayer and the ten commandments" and "*ancient Litanies and Liturgies.*" O'Curry's *Lectures on the Manuscript Materials of Ancient Irish History*, p. 353. There is also extant a remarkable tract, in the native tongue, "containing the ancient ritual for the consecration of a church or oratory." *Ibid.* p. 357. The celebrated Colgu of Clonmacnois, who died in A.D. 789, left behind him a work in Irish, to which he gave the rather extraordinary name of *The Besom of Devotion*, which contained prayers "apparently offered at mass time." *Ibid.* p. 379.

[3] In the tract *De Tribus Habitaculis*, only three places—Heaven, Earth, and Hell—are recognised; and Purgatory is ignored. This tract was long ascribed to Patrick; but though not written by the apostle of Ireland, it may safely be regarded as an exposition of his views on the subjects of which it treats.

[4] See his *Life* by Adamnan, lib. ii. 40.

[5] *Ibid.* lib. ii. 45.

first time,[1]—and said to have been written about A.D. 664, when disease was making sad havoc in the country—the author cries for aid to a whole crowd of deceased worthies. Abel, Eli, and Enoch—Abraham, Isaac, Moses, and Aaron—Job, David, and the Maccabees—John the Baptist, Mary, Joseph, the spirit of Stephen, and a host of others—are all invoked by him for protection against the Yellow Pestilence. But, in the midst of this folly, the Scriptures were studied more assiduously in Ireland than in any other part of Europe; and, whilst the pulpit was almost silent elsewhere, the Irish clergy were still known as effective preachers. Sermons and homilies prepared by them, with the texts prefixed, are yet forthcoming.[2] This constant appeal to the authority of Scripture had a healthful moral influence; and served, in times of degeneracy, to secure to Irish theologians a position of comparative superiority. In one of the oldest ecclesiastical monuments of the country—written in the native tongue apparently after this period—it is refreshing to find a most impressive testimony to the excellence of the Word of God. According to this venerable witness, the Bible, instead of being a fomenter of divisions, is eminently fitted to promote the peace of the true body of Christ, to extinguish heresy and schism, and to advance the progress of spiritual enlightenment.[3] It should be studied by all classes in the church. "One of the noble gifts of the Holy Spirit," says

---

[1] By the Irish Archæological and Celtic Society. Dublin, 1869. The hymn of St. Colman Mac Ui Clusaigh. *Book of Hymns*, part ii. 123-136. It would appear that the writer was himself cut off by the plague, so that he appealed to the Saints in vain. He is said to have been the author of the poem on the death of Cummian already quoted, p. 67 and p. 82, and to have been his tutor. He was a strong adherent of the Roman party in Ireland; and has been described as at the head of the seminary founded by Finnbarr in Cork. O'Curry's *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Irish*, by Sullivan, ii. 90, 91.

[2] See O'Curry's *Lectures on the MS. Materials of Ancient Irish History*, pp. 352-357.

[3] "To be a *Fer-Leighlinn, Druimchli*, or chief master in a college or great school, the candidate was obliged by law to be a master of the whole course of Gaeheldic literature, in prose and verse, besides *that of the Scriptures, from the ten commandments up to the whole Bible.*" O'Curry's *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Irish*, by Sullivan, ii. 84. There are various traces of ancient versions of the Scriptures in the Irish tongue. Ibid. i. cclviii; ii. 170; iii. 359.

this document, "is the Holy Scripture, by which all ignorance is enlightened, and all worldly affliction comforted; by which all spiritual light is kindled, and by which all debility is made strong. For it is through the Holy Scriptures that heresy and schism are banished from the Church, and all contentions and divisions reconciled. It is in them well tried counsel and appropriate instruction will be found for every degree in the Church. It is through them the snares of demons and vices are banished from every faithful member of the Church. For the divine Scriptures are the mother, and the benign nurse of all the faithful who meditate on them, and contemplate them, and who are nurtured by them until they are chosen children of God by their advice."[1]

[1] O'Curry's *Lectures*, p. 376-7. From an *Exposition of the Ceremonies of the Mass*, of which the original is preserved in the *Leabhar Breac*.

CHAPTER V.

FROM THE DEATH OF ADAMNAN TO THE FIRST ATTACK OF THE NORTHMEN ON IRELAND. A.D. 704 TO A.D. 795.[1]

THE aversion of the monks of Iona to the Roman mode of keeping Easter has been already noticed; and we have seen how, unmoved by all the arguments of their own abbot, they adhered to their ancient rule for celebrating the festival. But, about twelve years after the death of Adamnan, the monastery was brought over to conformity. Naitan, or Nechtan, king of the Picts, was mainly instrumental in effecting this revolution. Having carefully studied the subject, and ascertained clearly, as he thought, the superior claims of the Roman Easter, he determined to establish its observance throughout all his dominions.[2] He was much assisted by Egbert, a learned monk, who repaired to the west of Scotland in A.D. 716, and laboured with great earnestness to recommend his views to the fraternity of Iona. Force was added to persuasion; and those members of the brotherhood who still refused to yield were banished from the island.[3] All the monks in Ireland, subject to the jurisdiction of Hy, soon afterwards acceded to the new method of observance.[4]

---

[1] This is the date adopted by O'Flaherty and Todd. See Todd's *St. Patrick*, p. 39, *note;* and *The War of the Gaedhill with the Gaill*. Introduction, xxxiv O'Donovan adopts the date A.D. 794.

[2] Bede, v. 21.

[3] In the *Annals of Ulster* this transaction is thus noticed:—"The expulsion of the family of Hy beyond Drum Albin (*i.e.* the Grampian hills) by King Nectan." It has been thought that the refractory monks were transported to Abernethey. See Jamieson's *Culdees*, 292-294.

[4] Bede, v. 22.

In the beginning of the seventh century, as has already been stated, the missionaries recently arrived from Rome made their first approach to the bishops or abbots of Hibernia. Their advances were received with anything but cordiality; and yet, after an opposition kept up for upwards of one hundred years, the Italian Easter cycle and the Italian tonsure were at length adopted all over the country. We are not, however, to imagine that the Church of Ireland now formally submitted to papal authority. Throughout the whole of the discussions relative to the Paschal festival, the bishop of Rome was rarely mentioned; the simple fact that the Irish and British long adhered to their ancient usages is sufficient to prove that they rejected his dictation; and the papal advocates well knew that it would be useless to appeal to his award, inasmuch as their opponents disowned his jurisdiction. They accordingly professed to draw all their arguments from Scripture—sustained by right reason and the practice of the Church universal.[1] When, therefore, the Irish Christians adopted the Roman cycle and the Roman tonsure, they did not, as a matter of course, recognise the papal supremacy. The Hibernian Church was thus, no doubt, brought into more friendly relations with the Church of Rome; and, from this date, its ecclesiastics had much intercourse with their brethren in England and on the Continent; but, for centuries afterwards, it retained almost all its other peculiarities of polity and worship.

Long before this period the celibacy of the clergy had been strictly enforced wherever the bishop of Rome had sufficient power to exact obedience. The Eastern Catholics never adopted this ascetic discipline. The canons of a great Council held at Constantinople in A.D. 692, give express permission to presbyters and deacons to live in wedlock[2]—an arrangement which the Greek Church has since uninter-

[1] One of the most elaborate vindications of the Roman mode of keeping Easter is the long letter of the Abbot Ceolfrid to the King Naitan. See Bede, v. 21. The argument there employed, at a late stage of the controversy, is very much of the character described in the text.

[2] See particularly Canon 13. This Council has been called the Quini-Sextum Synod. In the Greek Church marriage is forbidden only to the bishops and higher dignitaries.

ruptedly maintained. In various parts of the West it was found impossible to prevent clerical marriages; and they were sanctioned, either explicitly or by implication, by several synods.[1] In Britain, in the sixth century, the ministers of religion were not bound to a single life; bishops were fathers of families; and Gildas, who was living among them, complains that some of them were polygamists.[2] Patrick, the apostle of Hibernia, was himself of clerical descent; he admitted married men to the ministry;[3] and in the early Irish Church, notwithstanding the prevalence of the monastic spirit, it was not considered at all unlawful for an individual connected with the sacred profession to be the husband of one wife. A canon of an old Hibernian Synod at which Patrick is said to have been present, but which was evidently held after the general adoption of the Italian tonsure in the eighth century,[4] attests that Irish churchmen had no reason to fear ecclesiastical censure on the ground of matrimony, if they only took care to have themselves and their wives unexceptionably attired. "The cleric, whoever he may be, from a sexton to a priest," says this canon,[5] "who does not wear a

[1] Thus, the 19th Canon of the Fourth Council of Toledo, held A.D. 633, forbids the admission to the priesthood of those who had many wives, or who had married widows. See also 44th Canon of the same Council, and the 3rd Canon of the Council of Verberie, held A.D. 752. See *Dupin*, ii. 5, 30.

[2] De Excidio Britanniae, 67, 108, 109. About the end of the seventh century the old British clergy still continued to marry. Hence Aldhelm accuses them of violating "ecclesiastical chastity." See before, p. 58, *note* (2).

[3] In the *Book of Armagh* we are told that Patrick ordained Fiach Finn, "*a man with but one wife*," as a bishop. Betham, ii. 400. In the *Senchus Mor*, or old Brehon law, the married bishop, who transgresses, is regarded with more indulgence than the unmarried bishop. "*The bishop of one wife* does return [to his former dignity] *i.e.* when he performs penance within three days." *Senchus Mor*, i. 57, 59.

[4] Even Dr. Lanigan himself admits that this canon could not have been made until after the Irish had received the Roman tonsure. (*Ecc. Hist.*, iv. 362.) But Dr. Moran (*Essays*, p. 304-9) stoutly denies this conclusion. He refers to the fact that, in the days of Pope Damasus, the effeminate Roman clergy were in the habit of wearing long hair like women, and that they were forbidden to do so; but he has entirely failed to show that there was any prescribed Roman tonsure when Patrick came to Ireland. The case of "some monk," mentioned by Paulinus of Nola, is nothing to the purpose. The Irish tonsure was probably quite as ancient as the Roman; and the tenacity with which our forefathers adhered to it proves that Patrick had not taught them submission to the Pope.

[5] The following is the canon as given by Villanueva:—"Quicumque clericus,

tunic to cover his nakedness, and who has not his hair tonsured after the Roman manner; and his wife, who appears in public with an unveiled head—are to be alike despised by the laity, and separated from the Church."[1] In the eighth century the son sometimes succeeded the father even in the abbatial office; and such an occurrence is recorded by the annalists without any mark of disapprobation.[2]

The Irish missionaries, who laboured on the Continent in the eighth century, often came into collision with the adherents of the Roman Church. Accustomed at home to arrangements very different from those they found abroad, and

---

ab ostiario usque ad sacerdotem, sine tunicâ visus fuerit, atque turpitudinem ventris et nuditatem non tegat, et si non more Romano capilli ejus tonsi sint, et uxor ejus si non velato capite ambulaverit: pariter a laicis contemnentur, et ab ecclesiâ separentur."—SANCTI PATRICII, *Synodi, Canones, Opuscula*, p. 2. Dublin, 1835. At this time all church-officers—including the sextons or door-keepers—were called clerics or clergymen; and those who devoted themselves to the service of the Church generally commenced their ecclesiastical career in the lowest grade of the ministry.

[1] Dr. Moran has discovered that, in some MSS. the word *ejus* (his) is wanting after *uxor* (wife); and on this ground he pleads that *uxor* means any married woman—not being a clergyman's wife. (*Essays*, 308-9.) By "a man and wife," we always understand "a man and *his* wife," but, according to Dr. Moran "a cleric and wife" must signify "a cleric *and another man's wife*;" The cleric and wife are here, beyond all question, a married *pair*. They are bound together in the plural number (*pariter contemnentur*), and they cannot be put asunder.

[2] Thus, in the *Annals of the Four Masters* we meet with such entries as the following:—

"A.D. 731, Crunmhael, son of Colgan, abbot of Lusk, died;
A.D. 779, Conall, son of Crunmhael, abbot of Lusk, died;
A.D. 782, Colga, son of Crunmhael, abbot of Lusk, died."

Here Crunmhael was succeeded by his two sons Conall and Colga. Again we read in the same annals.—

"A.D. 753, Gorman, Coarb (or successor as abbot) of Mochta, of Louth, died at Clonmacnois, on his pilgrimage. *He was father of Torbach*, co-arb of Patrick (*i.e.* abbot of Armagh)."

"Marriage," says King (*Memoir on the Primacy of Armagh*, p. 21) "was not regarded as in any way disreputable for a clergyman in Ireland in those days; seeing that the famous Conn-na-mbocht, 'the glory and dignity of Clonmacnois,' although *a Head of Culdees*, was married; and was also the son of a spiritual adviser, or confessor of Clonmacnois, the grandson of a lector, or divinity professor, and the great-grandson of a bishop." So untrue is the averment sometimes made that there is no instance of a married clergyman in the ancient Church of Ireland.

possessed of greatly superior intelligence to many who occupied influential positions in other countries, they firmly defended their peculiarities, and perplexed the ruling powers by their non-conformity. Boniface, Archbishop of Mentz—commonly called "The Apostle of Germany"[1]—a man who did more to increase the papal authority north of the Alps than any other ecclesiastic of his generation, was sadly troubled by these Hibernian preachers. A certain Irishman, named Clemens, who travelled about with two sons—and who, withal, had the hardihood to maintain that he was an apostolic bishop—exceedingly disturbed the primate's equanimity. Forgetting that many of the original heralds of the gospel were husbands and fathers,[2] Boniface described this married evangelist as living in adultery.[3] When he attempted to convince him of the sin of clerical matrimony by quoting testimonies from Jerome, Augustine, or Pope Gregory, the Irishman remained unmoved; as, according to his views, these patrons of monasticism were not entitled to be the arbiters of his faith or practice. When Boniface endeavoured to sustain his cause by appealing to the Canons of the Councils, Clemens was ready to reply that these Canons had been passed by ecclesiastical assemblies in which the Irish Church had no representative, and that their members were at best only erring mortals like himself. The Word of God was the only authority to which he was prepared to yield submission. He is said to have maintained the lawfulness of marriage with the sister of a deceased wife, and to have held other views which Boniface pronounced "horrible;"[4] but all the information we possess respecting him, is derived from the report of his assailants; and there is reason to believe that the Archbishop has given a distorted statement of his principles. When

[1] Boniface was made archbishop of Mentz in A.D. 745, and was martyred in A.D. 755. He came into collision with Clemens about A.D. 744. He is commonly considered an Englishman by birth; but some affirm that he was a native of Ireland. See Moran's *Essays on the Early Irish Church*, p. 151.

[2] Mark i. 30; 1 Cor. ix. 5; 1 Tim. iii. 2, 4.

[3] Affirmat se, post duos filios sibi in adulterio natos (sub nomine episcopi) esse posse legis Christianae episcopum.

[4] Multa alia horribilia de praedestinatione Dei contraria fidei Catholicae affirmat.

Boniface discovered that he was unable to silence Clemens by argument or remonstrance, he wrote a letter of complaint to Pope Zachary,[1] suggesting that the arm of the civil power should interfere, and that the unmanageable Irishman should be thrown into prison. Zachary was unwilling, in the first instance, to take a step so decided; and we know nothing of the subsequent career of the obnoxious missionary, as he now disappears from history.[2]

Clemens was not the only Irishman who crossed the path of Boniface. Another native of the Western Isle named Virgil, or Ferghil, became involved in rather an odd controversy with the Archbishop. Some stupid cleric in Bavaria, when administering the initiatory rite of the Christian Church, had so blundered when pronouncing the baptismal formula as to make it literally unintelligible.[3] Boniface maintained that the ordinance was invalid, and that it must be repeated. Virgil argued that a grammatical inaccuracy, arising from pure ignorance, should be overlooked; and that those to whom the rite had been dispensed should not be required to submit to a second celebration. When the case was brought before the tribunal of the Pope, Zachary decided against the Archbishop.[4] Not long afterwards Virgil came again into collision with Boniface. The Irishman, it seems, cultivated a taste for mathematics; he has, in consequence, been distinguished by the name of "The Geometer;"[5] and, in the course of his studies, the idea appears to have occurred to him that this world of ours is a globe, and that the other side of it may be inhabited. The bold speculation startled both Boniface and the Pope. When the Archbishop of Mentz

[1] This letter, giving an account of Clemens, may be found in Ussher's *Sylloge, Epist.* xv. Works by Elrington, iv. 457-60.

[2] See *Neander*, v. 77-80. There is good evidence that Irishmen laboured as missionaries in Iceland in the eighth century. See Lanigan, iii. 227-8.

[3] This ignoramus baptised, "In nomine Patria, et Filia, et Spiritu Sancta," instead of "In nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti."

[4] The letter of Zachary may be found in Ussher's *Sylloge, Epist.* xvi. Works, iv. 461.

[5] In the *Annals of the Four Masters*, at A.D. 784, we have the following entry; "Ferghil, *i.e.* the Geometer—died in Germany." The true date of his death appears to have been somewhat later. See Lanigan, iii. 206; and O'Donovan's *Four Masters*, i. 391, *note*.

communicated the intelligence to Zachary, he received strict orders to deal very summarily with the daring heretic. "If it shall appear," said the Pope, "that he so confesses that there may be another world and other men under the earth, summon a council, deprive him of the honour of the priesthood, expel him from the Church."[1] It was eventually ascertained that, in hunting after false doctrine, Boniface had plunged into a subject beyond his depth. Virgil, as there is cause to believe, succeeded in convincing Zachary that his theory of antipodes was harmless; during his stay on the Continent he conformed to the arrangements of the Church of Rome;[2] and, in A.D. 756, he was appointed to the bishopric of Saltzburg. He died nearly thirty years afterwards.

Ireland maintained its literary reputation throughout the whole of the eighth century. Two of her learned sons, who passed over into France in the reign of Charlemagne, were singularly honoured by that celebrated sovereign. Their first appearance in the country has been described by a monk of St. Gall, who flourished in the following century; and, though some parts of his narrative apparently belong to the

[1] Ussher's *Sylloge, Epist.* xvii. Works, iv. 464.

[2] There is a passage in the *Life of Virgil* which has quite puzzled interpreters, but which may be easily explained on the principle that the Irish presbyter abbots claimed and exercised the power of ordination. It appears that Virgil was abbot of Aghaboe before he left his native country; and that, when on the continent, he became abbot of St. Peter's Monastery, in Saltzburg. He remained abbot there nearly two years. During all this time his biographer states that "*he concealed his ordination*," and that meanwhile he employed his country-man bishop Dobda, who resided in the monastery, "to perform episcopal duty." "Vir itaque Domini, dissimulata ordinatione, ferme duorum annorum spatiis, habuit secum episcopum comitantem de patria, nomine Dobda, ad persolvendum episcopale officium." MABILLON'S *Acta SS.* tom. iv. p. 280 as quoted by Todd, by *St. Patrick*, p. 65, *note*. The meaning here cannot be that meanwhile he passed himself off as a layman. He would thus have been disqualified to act as abbot. Even Boniface and Zachary knew that he professed to be a priest; and, when he broached his doctrine about antipodes, the Pope proposed that he should be deposed from the priesthood "sacerdotii honore privatum." The meaning of his biographer must be that, when abbot of St. Peter's monastery, he did not acknowledge his power of ordination—he did not assert his right to ordain even monks belonging to his own monastery – but, to avoid giving offence in a country in which different usages prevailed, he caused bishop Dobda, his friend who lived in the establishment, and who is therefore called "his own bishop," to perform, when required, what were there considered the peculiar functions of the episcopal office.

department of romance, he has, on the whole, not incorrectly estimated the character of these distinguished strangers.

"When," says he, "the illustrious Charles began to reign alone[1] in the Western parts of the world, and literature was everywhere almost forgotten, there came, with some British merchants to the shores of France, two Scots of Ireland—men incomparably skilled in human learning, and in the Holy Scriptures. As they produced no merchandise for sale, they used to cry out to the crowds flocking (to the market-place) to make purchases, 'If any one wants wisdom, let him come to us and get it, for we have it to sell.' Their reason for saying that they had it to sell was that, as the people were inclined to deal in saleable articles and to take nothing gratuitously, they might stir them up to the acquisition of wisdom as well as of other articles for which they must give value; or, as may appear by the result, that by speaking in such a manner, they might excite their curiosity and wonder. They repeated this cry so often that an account of them was conveyed, either by their admirers or by those who thought them mad, to King Charles, who, being a lover of wisdom, and very desirous to attain it, had them brought with all haste before him; and asked them if, as had been reported to him, they truly possessed wisdom. They answered that they did, and were ready, in the name of the Lord, to impart it to such as would seek it worthily. When he asked them what compensation they would expect for it, they replied that they required nothing more than convenient accommodation, ingenuous minds, and, as being in a foreign country, a supply of food and raiment. Charles having heard their proposals, was filled with joy, and kept both of them with himself for a short period. After some time, when obliged to proceed on a military expedition, he ordered one of them, whose name was Clemens, to remain in France, entrusting to his care a great number of youths, not only of the highest nobility, but also of the middle and lower classes—all of whom were, by his orders, provided with food and suitable habitations. The other, by name Albin, he sent to Italy, and assigned to him

[1] He became sole sovereign of the French Monarchy A.D. 771, and died in A.D. 814.

the monastery of St. Augustine, near Pavia, that such as chose to do so, might there resort to him for instruction." [1]

In the beginning of the reign of Charlemagne, Ireland was in a very unsettled condition. The petty princes of the country were almost perpetually at war with each other; famine, with disease following in its wake, thinned the population; and strange convulsions of the elements awakened wide alarm.[2] Men of learning, unable to enjoy peace at home, began to think of emigration; and the fame of the young French king, as a patron of literature, attracted them to the Continent. When Clemens and Albin reached their port of destination, the inhabitants of the place, hearing of the arrival of a ship freighted with merchandise, may have hastened down to the quay; and, supposing the scholars to be traders, perhaps inquired what they had to sell. Clemens and Albin, amused by the mistake, may have replied, with the ready wit of Irishmen, that they dealt in literature or wisdom; and some such little incident, distorted and magnified in the course of frequent repetitions, at length, in all likelihood, assumed the shape in which it appears in the pages of the monk of St. Gall. It is exceedingly unlikely that the two strangers were introduced to Charlemagne in the way this writer represents. In all probability they carried with them credentials, or letters, which secured for them a favourable reception.

It is evident that the religious views of the great monarch of the West must have been considerably enlarged and

---

[1] This extract is taken from a work in two books, entitled "*De gestis Caroli Magni*," by a writer commonly known as Monachus Sangallensis. They are addressed to Charles the Fat, and must have been written between A.D 884 and A.D. 888. See Lanigan, iii. 207-211. The work of the monk of St. Gall may be found in Migne's *Patrol. Cursus*, tom. xcviii. 1371, 1372.

[2] The *Annals of the Four Masters*, at A.D. 767, tell of "the fair of the clapping of hands, so called because terrific and horrible signs appeared at the time, which were like unto the signs of the day of judgment, namely, great thunder and lightning, so that it was insufferable to all to hear the one and see the other. Fear and horror seized the men of Ireland, so that their religious seniors ordered them to make two fasts, together with fervent prayer, and one meal between them, to protect and save them from the pestilence."—*The Annals of Ulster* place these events in A.D. 771.

rectified by his intercourse with these learned Irishmen. Though Charlemagne often encouraged the pretensions of the Papacy—believing, no doubt, that they could be made subservient to his own aggrandizement—he had no idea of yielding implicit submission to the Bishop of Rome. He claimed the right of confirming the appointment to the papal chair; and in one instance he did not hesitate to sit in judgment on its occupant.[1] His zeal for the diffusion of the Scriptures was certainly not inspired by the Italian high priest. It may be traced to the distinguished Hibernians who surrounded him, and to men of kindred principles whose society he cultivated.[2] In Ireland the Word of God was still studied with avidity; and from the days of Columbkille there were monks here who spent much of their time in transcribing the holy records. It is well known that we are indebted to the arrangements of this illustrious sovereign for a large portion of the manuscript copies of the sacred writings at present in existence.[3] In other matters Charlemagne had no sympathy with the proceedings of the Western Patriarch. When the Pope sanctioned the worship of images, this strong-minded prince opposed him; and the Council of Francfort—held under his auspices, in A.D. 794, and consisting of no less than three hundred members—openly condemned the idolatry patronized at Rome.[4] There is every reason to believe that Charlemagne, on this occasion, was supported by the authority of his Irish doctors.

Charlemagne was led to form a very high estimate of the

---

[1] See Robertson's *History of the Christian Church*, vol. ii. Part i., p. 133, London, 1862.

[2] Especially to Alcuin, the Englishman, who cultivated intercourse with these literary Irishmen.

[3] Guizot's *History of Civilization*, ii. 236, London, 1853.

[4] Mosheim's *Institutes* by Soames, ii. 168, London, 1841. In the Caroline books, which express the decisions of the Council of Francfort, Charlemagne "rejects alike adoration, worship, reverence, veneration (of images). He will not admit the kneeling before them, the burning of lights, or offering of incense, or the kissing of a lifeless image, though it represents the Virgin and the child. Images are not even to be reverenced as the Saints, as living men, as relics, as the Bible." —MILMAN'S *Latin Christianity*, vol. ii. 302. These were the views of the Irish Doctors of the eighth century.

ability of other Irish scholars, who became known to him after he had made provision for Clemens and Albin; and, at a later period of his reign, unquestionably held out to them inducements to settle in his dominions. His friend and favourite Alcuin[1]—to whom he was directly indebted for much of the information he possessed—kept up an epistolary intercourse with some of the literati[2] of this country; and, in a letter still extant,[3] addressed by him to Colcu or Colgu, Lector of Clonmacnois,[4] expresses the esteem and affection he cherished for his Hibernian correspondent. Colgu must have been a person of no ordinary merit when he could elicit such a testimony[5] from one of the most erudite and influential ecclesiastics of the eighth century. It appears that, along with this epistle, Alcuin sent various presents, including certain sums of money from Charlemagne himself, to the monks of Clonmacnois and Lismore, accompanied by a request that the brethren would pray for the king's prosperity. These facts, as well as others which it is here unnecessary to detail,[6] clearly show that, in the multitude of his engagements, the great monarch of the West did not overlook Ireland.

Some advocates of the doctrine of apostolical succession delight to dwell on the perfection of the ecclesiastical title-deeds of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Ireland. They describe them as most excellent in their kind—as greatly superior to those of the Church of England—as, in fact,

[1] Alcuin was by birth an Englishman. Charlemagne first met him in Italy; and was so charmed with his new acquaintance that he did not rest until he attached him to his Court. He did so about A.D. 780. Alcuin died in A.D. 804, aged 70.

[2] One of these was named Joseph. See Lanigan, iii. 231.

[3] This letter may be found in Ussher's *Syllage, Epist.* xviii.

[4] A Lector, or Fearleighlinn, was a Professor of Theology. See King's *Memoir*, p. 27. Colgu was considered the most learned Irishman of his age, and was called "the doctor of all the Scots." He wrote the first Prayer Book mentioned in the Irish Annals.—*The Besom of Devotion.* See before, p. 87, *note* (2).

[5] Alcuin addresses Colgu as "Pater sanctissime," and complains because he had not received letters from him more frequently. "Nescio quid peccavi, quia tuae paternitatis dulcissimas literas multo tempore non merui videre."

[6] O'Conor states in his *Dissertations on the History of Ireland* (p. 226) that, in an ancient painting in the palace of Versailles, the King of Ireland might be seen with an Irish harp at his right side, among a company of princes in amity with Charlemagne.

presenting a chain in which no flaw or defect can be discovered from Patrick to the present times.[1] In works of established reputation we find lists professing to give all the Archbishops of Armagh, from the fifth or sixth to the nineteenth century;[2] and many have perused these catalogues as if they were of unimpeachable authority. Recent investigations have demonstrated their utter worthlessness. We are told by a writer who has carefully examined the annals of our country, and who cannot even be suspected of any sectarian predilections, that "there was no such person as the *Archbishop of Armagh* ever known or heard of, or mentioned in any history or legend, written in the six hundred years" which succeeded the death of the Apostle of Ireland.[3] It cannot be said that, during all this time, the word *ard-epscop*, or Archbishop, was unknown in Ireland; but it was certainly not used in the technical sense elsewhere assigned to it—implying a presiding bishop or metropolitan. It betokened no superiority of power or jurisdiction; it merely denoted an eminent or distinguished bishop[4]—a bishop greatly respected

---

[1] Thus Bishop Mant says, "*not a shadow of a doubt* can be thrown on the apostolical succession in that church." "The true episcopal character of the hierarchy of the Irish church is unquestioned and *unquestionable*."—*Hist. of the Church of Ireland*, i. 270. In 1705 we find King, archbishop of Dublin, stating, "our succession in Ireland is *more clear and unexceptionable* than our neighbours" (in England)—MANT'S *Hist.* ii. 175. See also Bishop Wordsworth's *History of the Church of Ireland*, p. 221, London, 1869.

[2] See, for example, Murdock's *Mosheim* by Soames, ii. 727-8, London, 1841. See also Colgan's "*Catalogue of the Primates or Archbishops of the Metropolis of Armagh*" in King's *Memoir*, p. 67; and Todd's *St. Patrick*, 174, 175, 177-182.

[3] *Memoir Introductory to the Early History of Armagh.* By Robert King, A.B. Preface. Armagh, 1854. This work is dedicated by permission to the most Reverend Lord John George (Beresford) archbishop of Armagh; and the writer, in the Dedication, returns thanks to his patron for the use of the volumes from which he has drawn some of the most valuable portions of the Memoir. The fact stated in the text is corroborated by testimony furnished at judicial investigations held early in the seventeenth century. Thus in the Inquisition taken in Londonderry in September 1609, the jurors found that "all termon and herenagh land within the said county was at the first given by Columbkille and the succeeding abbots unto the several septs *before any bishops were known to be in this country*." See *Ordnance Survey of Londonderry*, i. p. 20, Dublin, 1837. Reference is here made to diocesan bishops.

[4] "The Irish word (ard-epscop) did not imply anything of jurisdiction; and is

or celebrated for his piety, or learning, or eloquence, or public usefulness. To an Irishman of the eighth century there appeared nothing incongruous in the existence of several Archbishops at the same time in the same district. A neighbourhood in which a number of Archbishops flourished contemporaneously would, according to his views, have been singularly privileged. Cogitosus, a monk of Kildare, who lived in the ninth century,[1] and who wrote a biography of the famous Saint Brigid, gives a strange account of the mode of procedure in the early Church of Ireland. He tells us that the great abbess seeing "she could not be without a high priest to consecrate churches, and to settle the ecclesiastical degrees in them," engaged a holy man named Conlaedh "*to govern the Church with her* in episcopal dignity." "*Her chair*," he adds, *both* "*episcopal* and virginal, like a fruitful vine spreading all around with growing branches, established itself in the whole Hibernian island, in which he (Conlaedh) *as Archbishop of the Irish bishops*, and she, as abbess, whom all abbesses of the Irish venerate, are pre-eminent in happy succession, and in perpetual order."[2]

According to another account Brigid herself was ordained a bishop by Mel, bishop of Armagh;[3] but though this statement may be set aside as apocryphal, we have ample evidence that, if she did not formally exercise the episcopal functions, she possessed the reality of episcopal jurisdiction. Conlaedh, her co-adjutor, was appointed bishop by her authority, and was expected to act according to her directions. Though he is described as "governing the Church *with her*," he could

not synonymous in this respect with our present use of the term archbishop. It denotes only an eminent or celebrated bishop." Todd's *St. Patrick*, p. 16.

[1] Petrie, in his *Ecclesiastical Architecture of Ireland*, p. 204, has tried to prove that Cogitosus flourished not earlier than the ninth century. Dr. Graves has attempted to show that he was the father of Muirchu Maccumachteni, the earliest biographer of Patrick, and that he flourished in the seventh century. See *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*, vol. viii. pp. 269-271, Dublin, 1864. The *Life of Brigid* by Cogitosus is to a great extent a miserable collection of legendary tales. It may be found in Colgan's *Triad. Thaumaturga*, and also in Migne's *Patrol Curs.* tom. lxxii. 778.

[2] See Todd's *St. Patrick*, 12, 13.

[3] *Ibid.* 13, *note.*

scarcely be said to have a will of his own, as he was simply employed to execute her orders. He was "pre-eminent" as "Archbishop of the Irish bishops," not because he was, in any sense, primate of all Ireland; but because, as Brigid's bishop, he occupied a position of peculiar distinction. She was esteemed in Ireland far superior to any individual of her age in point of sanctity; and her bishop stood higher in public estimation than any other Hibernian churchman.

The statement, that the Church of Ireland can trace a perfect episcopal succession, is a pure myth. Brigid was one of its early rulers; and she can scarcely be recognized as an unexceptionable link of the apostolic chain. As for diocesan bishops, the early Irish Christians had none whatever. "Nowhere, for six hundred years and more, from the death of their apostle Patrick," says an authority already quoted, "do we find in their Annals *the slightest trace* of government by a diocesan episcopacy. . . . Nowhere, before the twelfth century, have we in these Annals any single mention of a diocese, in our ordinary sense of the word, nor of a diocesan bishop. Nowhere, in the records of the preceding ages, do we find a single instance of any of the numberless ecclesiastics noticed in them applying to his bishop for direction or advice, under any circumstances whatsoever. Nowhere do we meet with a bishop governing a certain extent of territory, or a certain number of clergy, or engaged in any act understood to imply such jurisdiction or authority. The silence of those ancient records, of which we now speak, on all such particulars, is perfect and complete."[1]

The ecclesiastical government, established in North Britain by Columbkille, may be taken as a specimen of the system which long prevailed in Ireland. Bede, as we have seen,[2] tells us that even the bishops throughout the whole Pictish province were subject to the jurisdiction of the presbyter abbot of Iona. The early Irish church was governed after the same fashion. "The whole ecclesiastical fabric," says one of our highest authorities in such matters, "was constructed on the monastic foundation, and its entire economy regulated by

[1] King's *Memoir*, p. 1.

[2] See before, p. 34.

the discipline of conventual life. This was the system which for ages *placed the episcopte in a sub ordinate position*, exalting the office of abbot to the pinnacle of church preferment, and subjecting all other relations to its social weight." [1]

The learned writer who makes these statements asserts elsewhere that "there were *at all times* bishops connected with the society, resident at Hy, or some dependent church, who were subject to the abbot's jurisdiction;" and who were "called in to ordain, very much as the bishops of the *Unitas Fratrum* in the present day." [2] Ordination is, as he conceives, the peculiar prerogative of the bishop; and he affirms that, even in Iona in the time of Columbkille, this "essential function of the episcopal office was scrupulously maintained." [3] A bishop, he seems to think, was kept about the monastery as a kind of ecclesiastical convenience; and he was obliged to ordain any one pointed out to him by the abbot, his lord and master. In after-times a prelate in such a humiliating position might, we admit, have been found connected with some of the great conventual establishments; [4] but there is no proof whatever that such a personage resided at Iona in the days of Columbkille or his immediate successors. We have evidence directly the reverse. It is stated in the Saxon Chronicle, at A.D. 560, that "Columba, presbyter, came to the Picts, and converted them to the faith of Christ. . . . Thenceforth there ought to be always in Hy an abbot, *but no bishop;* and to him ought all the Scottish bishops to be subject; for this reason that Columba was an abbot, not a bishop." [5]

[1] Reeves's *Culdees of the British Islands*, p. 28. Dublin, 1864.

[2] Reeves's *Adamnan*, p. 340. Among the Moravians, the bishop is merely the executor of the wishes of the Elders Conference of the Unity. He can ordain only such persons as they sanction, and he is himself amenable to them.

[3] Reeves's *Adamnan*, p. 341.

[4] Several examples of such bishops may be found in Todd's *St. Patrick*, pp. 51, 56, 57.

[5] See the original in Jamieson's *Historical Account of the Ancient Culdees*, p. 92. It is no proof of some of the early abbots of Hy having been bishops that they are so styled by some later annalists. Columbkille himself has been called by one of these writers "Archbishop of Scotland." See Jamieson, p. 51. The testimony of Bede is express that the abbot of Hy, till his own time, was *always* a presbyter.

There is also distinct and satisfactory evidence that the abbot of Iona did not consider ordination "an essential function of the episcopal office." He claimed and exercised it as his own prerogative. Columbkille himself, as Adamnan informs us, "ordained" King Aidan.[1] His successors and their senior monks ordained several of the English bishops of the seventh century.[2] When the abbot Findchan—who presided over a monastic establishment under the jurisdiction of Columbkille—attempted to evade the responsibility of ordaining an unworthy candidate, by sending for a neighbouring bishop to perform the ceremony, the deputy whom he employed on the occasion, refused, at the last moment, to take upon himself the entire odium of the infamous transaction. Though he was willing to repeat the words of consecration, he would not ordain until Findchan consented to join with him in the imposition of hands. In the end, the abbot was obliged to make himself accountable for the proceeding by placing his own right hand first on the head of the worthless applicant. When Columbkille heard of the transaction, his indignation was directed, not against the bishop, who was the mere tool of Findchan, but against the abbot himself, who was the chief offender. Neither did he blame him for exceeding his powers by laying on his hand first in ordination; but for abusing his prerogative, and for resorting to a base artifice to shield himself from censure. Hence he is said to have pronounced a malediction on the hand which the abbot, "in defiance of right and ecclesiastical law," had laid "on the head of the son of perdition."[3]

We may thus see how vain is the imagination that it is possible, beginning with the time of Patrick, to trace down an unbroken series of episcopal ordinations in the church of

[1] See before, p. 36, *note* (3). In another case Columbkille is represented as ordaining a bishop. "Columbanus, qui *ad insulam Hyth ad S. Columbam tergens*, illic gradum episcopalem accepit: et iterum ad suam patriam reversus est." *Vita S. Itae.* c. 21. (*Colg. act. SS.* p. 69, a.) Reeves's *Adamnan*, p. 341, *note.*

[2] Sicque illum *ordinantes* ad praedicandum miserunt. Bede, iii. 5. Aidano episcopo ab hac vita sublato, Finan pro illo gradum episcopatus, *a Scottis ordinatus* ac missus, acceperat, iii. 25.

[3] "Illa manus dextra quam Findchanus, contra fas et jus ecclesiasticum, super caput filii perditionis imposuit, mox computrescet."—*Vita San. Columb.* Lib. i. 36.

Ireland. In the sixth and seventh centuries the presbyter abbots presided when candidates were admitted into the ministry within the precincts of the monastery; and if—as seems probable—after the adoption of the Roman Easter,[1] a new system was gradually established, we have at present no means of investigating the history of the change. It can, however, be demonstrated that the lists, so long paraded as exhibiting the succession of the Primates of Armagh, are, in reality, the names of the abbots of that place.[2] The same account may be given of other documents purporting to be catalogues of Irish bishops or archbishops. In early times, the monastic colleges were the fountains of power, as well as of instruction; and the abbots were the presiding rulers of the church. The representative of the original abbot, or founder of the monastery, was designated his *co-arb*,[3] that is, *his heir*, co-heir, or successor. Thus, the abbot of Armagh was called the co-arb of Patrick; the abbot of Bangor, the co-arb of Comghall; the abbot of Iona, the co-arb of Columbkille; the abbot of Clonmacnois, the co-arb of Ciaran; the abbot of Clonard, the co-arb of Finnian; and the abbot of Clonfert, the co-arb of Brendan.[4] The term co-arb had reference to the succession, not in the episcopal, but in the abbatial office.[5]

[1] It would appear, however, from the case of Virgil, who was abbot of Aghaboe about the middle of the eighth century, and who, as explained in a preceding note, concealed his power of ordination when he first settled at Saltzburg, that the Irish abbots continued to ordain long after the settlement of the Easter question. See before, p. 96, *note* (2).

[2] King's *Memoir*, Preface. See also Todd's *St. Patrick*, pp. 172, 173.

[3] The word Comhorb (co-arb), according to Colgan, is derived from *com* or *con*, "cum," or "together with," and *forba*, *i.e.* a territory, farm, district; and signifies "a joint owner of a farm," "a lord of the same territory;" and came to be applied to a successor in the same ecclesiastical dignity, or rather in the same cathedral or monastery. See King's *Memoir*, p. 27. The word *co-arb*—sometimes improperly written *Corba*, and answering to the Irish *Comhorba*, or *Comharba*—is employed in the Irish annals as a common designation of the successors of all the eminent church-founding saints of Ireland. King's *Memoir*, p. 17.

[4] "It is a remarkable fact," says Dr. Reeves, "that many of the monastic churches, which grew in after times to be bishop's sees, were founded by presbyters; Clonard, by Finnian; Clonmacnois, by Ciaran; Clonfert, by Brendan; Aghabo, by Cainnech; Glendaloch, by Kevin; Lismore, by Carthagh; and Derry, Raphoe, and Hy, by Columba." *Adamnan*, p. 335.

[5] Reeves's *Ecc. Antiq.*, p. 136.

In very ancient times the abbot was more frequently a presbyter than a bishop.[1] He was the heir of the lands or territory which belonged to the monastery, as well as of its ecclesiastical dignity.[2] Hence it was that the abbatial line was carefully maintained, whilst there was no such continuity in the episcopal succession.[3]

An Irish bishop of the eighth century was simply a pastor, or minister of the gospel.[4] He might sometimes expatiate over a more ample territory than a modern parish, for the country was then very sparsely populated; and, under certain circumstances, he might officiate at two or three stations a few miles apart; but he had no resemblance to a modern diocesan. The county of Antrim, for example, had, in one section of it, a bishop of Connor,[5] a bishop of Rashee,[6] and a bishop of Kilroot.[7] In one district of the county of Down we find a bishop of Downpatrick,[8] a bishop of Bright,[9] and a bishop of Raholp.[10] In the same part of the same county we meet also with a bishop of Maghera,[11] a bishop of Nendrum,[12] and a bishop of Magh-Bile.[13] There were at least twenty-one bishops within the bounds of the present diocese of Meath.[14]

[1] "These successors were in the early ages *mostly presbyter abbots*." King's *Memoirs*. Pref.

[2] Todd's *St. Patrick*, pp. 155, 156.

[3] Reeves's *Eccl. Antiq.*, p. 136.

[4] Dr. Reeves all but admits this when he says that, at one time, "bishops were very numerous in Ireland, and were *in many instances ministers of single churches*." Archbishop Colton's *Visitation*, p. 114.

[5] Reeves's *Eccl. Antiq.*, p. 239.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 250. Rashee is about a mile from Ballycastle, and four or five miles from Connor.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 246. Kilroot is two miles from Carrickfergus, and ten or twelve miles from Rashee.

[8] *Ibid.* p. 144.

[9] *Ibid.* p. 142. Bright is three miles S.E. from Downpatrick.

[10] *Ibid.* p. 142. Raholp is three miles N.E. from Downpatrick.

[11] *Ibid.* p. 154. Maghera is about nine miles S.W. from Downpatrick, and two miles from Newcastle.

[12] *Ibid.* p. 148. Now called Mahee Island in Strangford Lough.

[13] *Ibid.* p. 151. Magh-Bile is about a mile N.E. from Newtownards.

[14] *Ibid.* p. 128. Five of these, viz.: Trim, Kells, Slane, Skreen, and Dunshaughlin, were, early in the thirteenth century, converted into the heads of rural deaneries.

In various places there were seven churches standing together, with a bishop for each.[1] These appear to have been high places of devotion, filled, at great festivals, with crowds of worshippers. There was a bishop of Rathlin,[2] a small island on the north coast of the county of Antrim, where one little parish church is still quite sufficient for the accommodation of the population. Other islands of even inferior magnitude were supplied each with a bishop.[3] Judging from the manner of proceeding at a somewhat later period, we are warranted to infer that the Irish bishop of the eighth century was elected by those among whom he ministered.[4] When about to be clothed with the pastoral commission, and when he did not receive investiture in the monastery to which he belonged, one of the neighbouring bishops seems commonly to have been employed to perform the ceremony; for the canon of the first council of Nice requiring at least three[5] to join in the ordination was not observed in Ireland. If a bishop was made the president of a monastery, he did not resign his episcopal title; and yet it was not as a bishop, but as an abbot, that he exercised jurisdiction. It not unfrequently happened that a bishop withdrew from public life into a monastery; and thus a number of bishops often lived there under the government of a presbyter abbot.[6]

---

[1] Todd's *St. Patrick*, pp. 32, 33.

[2] Reeves's *Eccl. Antiq.*, p. 249. According to the Government census of 1861, the whole population then amounted to 453 individuals. In ancient times there was a king, as well as a bishop, in Rathlin. See *Senchus Mor*, i. 82, 83.

[3] Thus Inniscattery, or Iniscathay, a small island at the mouth of the Shannon, was once a bishop's see. Connellan's *Annals of the Four Masters*, p. 19, *note* 1. The island contains only one hundred acres. It was made the chief seat of a diocese of the same name by the Synod of Rathbreasail in A.D. 1110. This diocese struggled for existence till A.D. 1363. See *Journal of the* (Kilkenny) *Royal Hist. and Arch. Assoc. of Ireland* for April 1874, pp. 113-116. This island contained seven churches, if not more, and a round tower. The round tower still exists.

[4] Thus, in A.D. 1074, Dunanus was made bishop of Dublin by consent and choice of the clergy and people, with the concurrence of the King. Ussher's *Religion of the Ancient Irish*, chap. viii.

[5] Canon 4.

[6] It is stated in a curious old poem, written in the Irish language, that Mochta of Louth, who is said to have been a disciple of Patrick, had at one time in his monastery 300 presbyters and 100 bishops. See Todd's *St. Patrick*, pp. 29, 30.

The monasteries were endowed with lands; as otherwise the monks connected with them could not have been fed and clothed. In the case of the more popular institutes, these landed possessions were extensive; and they were increased from time to time by the donations of kings or chieftains. It thus happened that, in the course of a few centuries, some of the abbots held an influential position among the territorial aristocracy. The property of the church was called *Termon*-land—probably from the *Termini*, pillar-stones, or crosses, set up to mark its boundaries.[1] Its owners at length claimed for it the right of sanctuary, as well as exemption from tribute and taxation; but they met with no little opposition in their attempts to establish such immunities.[2] The Termon lands were occupied, partly by persons in a state of complete servitude,[3] and partly by what were called 'free husbandmen,' who paid rents for the farms they cultivated, but who were not at liberty to remove to another neighbourhood.[4] "Thus," as it has been remarked, "in times past those who endowed churches and abbeys bestowed, not simply bare lands, but lands stocked, as it were, with certain septs and races, tied there perpetually to perform all services for the behoof and benefit of those to whom they were given."[5] The ecclesiastical property was managed by an agent or warden, called *Erenagh* or *Herenach*,[6] who superintended the serfs, collected

[1] Todd's *St. Patrick*, p. 160. "Let the *Termon* of the sacred place have its marks around it," says an old canon of the Irish Church. In the Latin of this canon the word Terminus is used. See Ussher's works by Elrington, xi. 423.

[2] Todd's *St. Patrick*, p. 160; King's *Memoir*, p. 18.

[3] It is stated in the *Book of Armagh* that "the sons of Tiechrach gave the plain in the North, between Gleori and Ferni, *with the slaves therein*, as an offering to Patrick for ever." Betham, ii. 394.

[4] King's *Memoir*, p. 18.

[5] Ussher's Works, by Elrington, xi. 423. Many of these tenants were mere slaves. "The fuidhir tenants of a chief, the daer stock tenants of a church. . . . idiots, dotards, fools, persons without sense, madmen, are similarly regarded with respect to their contracts." *Senchus Mor*, vol. iii. 11.

[6] "*Airchinneach*, the first form of the word, is derived, according to Colgan, from *ar* 'Super' (*i.e.* over) and *cionn* (another form of *ceand* or *ceann* 'the head') 'caput,' or, according to others, from *ard-cinn* 'a chief head,' and denotes as an ecclesiastical term, 'the hereditary warden of a church.' It occurs in the *Annals of the Four Masters*, for the first time at the year 601."—Reeves, *Colton's Visitation*, p. 4.

the rents, and insisted, when necessary, on a proper course of husbandry. The office of Erenagh was hereditary in the tribe; but the law of Tanistry[1] regulated the succession; that is, it was not determined merely by descent or birthright, but by the choice of the community. If the eldest son of the Erenagh was considered incompetent for the position, he might be set aside by the election of a brother, an uncle, or some other relative.[2]

We cannot now exactly determine in what way the succession of the abbots of Armagh was regulated; but we may presume that it was at least controlled by something like the law of tanistry.[3] The office of abbot was always held by a person of distinguished birth; and whilst the co-arb of Patrick may have been nominated by his predecessor, the consent of the heads of the tribe was probably necessary to complete his appointment. It is quite clear that, during the eighth century, his position rapidly advanced in power, dignity, and influence. In A.D. 732 an event occurred which must have taught the whole population the danger of incurring the displeasure of the great churchman. About that time a retainer of the King of Ulidia, or County Down,[4] who had visited the church of Kilharry in county Tyrone, and who had been kindly entertained there, passed on to the neighbouring church of Kilcooney, expecting to receive a similar welcome; but, when refreshment was refused to him,

[1] "By the law of Tanistry, the hereditary right of succession was not observed among the princes or rulers of countries, but the strongest, and he who had most followers, often the eldest and most worthy of the blood of the deceased king, succeeded; who, by the common suffrage of the people, in the life time of his predecessor, being appointed successor, was called *Tanist*, as much as to say *Second*."—Ware's *Antiquities of Ireland*, chap. viii.

[2] King's *Memoir*, p. 19.

[3] In certain cases the abbot was chosen by lot. "There are two reasons why the lot is cast—commonness of claim and equality of persons fit for the office" (of abbot).—*Senchus Mor*, vol. iii., p. 79. Dublin, 1873. We read in the Brehon law of "*the council* of the people of the church;" and it would seem that by this "council of the people" appointments were commonly made. *Senchus Mor*, vol. iii., p. 37. It is well known that the election of the successor of Columbkille, in later times, lay with "the men of Erin and Alba" (Scottish Dalriada). Reeves's *Adamnan*. Additional notes, p. 364.

[4] Ulidia also comprehended the part of County Antrim south of Slemish.

he lost his temper and committed some act of violence. As described by the Irish annalists, the offence was trivial; but it was evidently not so regarded by Congas the Abbot of Armagh. The church of Kilcooney, it would appear, was now claimed by him as under his care.[1] The insult offered to it wounded his pride, and he vowed vengeance. At his instigation Hugh Allan, king of Ireland, demanded satisfaction from the king of Ulidia; and when the latter tried to pass over the matter with a jest,[2] he was answered by a proclamation of war. The two princes met at the head of their respective armies near Dundalk; a bloody battle was fought; and the Ulidians were defeated. Their king was taken prisoner, and immediately afterwards beheaded on the step of the door of an adjoining church.[3]

In the eighth century confession to a priest was not required from all by any law of the church;[4] neither had the ordinance then assumed the form into which it was subsequently moulded. But every one disposed to lead a life of piety was recommended to make known his spiritual condition to some devout acquaintance, that he might obtain suitable advice: and in Ireland the person selected by any individual

---

[1] For a long time the borders of the princes of Ulidia and of Orgiall seem to have been very unsettled—the former claiming territory, of which the latter held possession. In A.D. 576 or 580 the Ulidians made an unsuccessful effort to recover possession of Emania itself. See O'Donovan's *Four Masters*, i. 210, *note*. It may be that, at the time mentioned in the text, they were disposed to assert a right to Kilcooney. Kilharry and Kilcooney were both in what is now the barony of Dungannon; and it seems probable that the King of Ulidia had not entirely given up his claim to rule over the district.

[2] Kilcooney was formerly called Ceall-*Cunna*; and Kilharry, Ceall-*Tairre*. The reply of the King of Ulidia was, it is thought, a pun on the names of the churches, implying that he would not separate the *head* from the *body*. See King's *Memoir*, p. 69. When he said "I will not separate its *Conn* for the *Tairr*," he may have meant that Kilcooney must do as Kilharry had done—perhaps, too, hinting that Down, not Armagh, was the head of both.

[3] The Church of Faughard in County Louth.

[4] Even in the ninth century the Council of Châlons, held A.D. 813, adopted the following as its 33rd canon:—"Some say that we ought to confess our sins *to God alone*; others affirm that they ought to be confessed to priests; *both are done* with great benefit in the holy church." Dupin, ii. 106. Until the Council of Lateran, in A.D. 1215, auricular confession was not imposed upon all by ecclesiastical authority.

as his religious counsellor was known by the endearing designation of his "soul-friend."[1] It so happened that Congas of Armagh now stood in this relation to the King of Ireland. Thus it was that the abbot possessed sufficient influence to induce his royal master to espouse his quarrel. Congas was a man of ability, as well as of towering ambition; and the King of Ulidia had in some way galled his pride. If, as is most probable, he upheld the ecclesiastical claims of his capital Downpatrick—in opposition to the pretensions of Armagh—we can well understand why the co-arb of Patrick was bent on his humiliation. He therefore seized on a comparatively frivolous act of indiscretion as a pretence for hostilities. The King of Ulidia had now, it seems, reigned for thirty years;[2] and perhaps imagined that he might safely venture to measure his strength with his hereditary enemy.[3] We may in this way account for the scoffing reply which he made to the demand for redress. But the result showed that he had over-estimated his resources; and his defeat and death convinced the people of Ulidia of the peril of refusing submission to the co-arb of Patrick.

Hugh Allan, King of Ireland, did more than any of his predecessors to promote the interests of Armagh.[4] He was prompted to seek its aggrandizement, partly by a regard for his "soul-friend" the co-arb Congas, and partly by considerations of political expediency; for he saw that his own influence over the petty kings and chieftains of the island would be much strengthened by the extension of the abbot's

[1] In the *Senchus Mor* the soul-friend is interpreted to mean "the hermit or pilgrim."—*Senchus Mor*, iii. vol. p. 15. Dublin, 1873. It thus appears that originally he was often not a clergyman.

[2] Keating's *History of Ireland*, p. 486. O'Mahony's *Translation*. New York, 1866.

[3] In A.D. 718 there was a bloody battle between the King of Ireland and the Leinstermen, in which the latter committed great havoc. War continued for years afterwards; and the King of Ulidia probably hoped to prevail against a rival weakened by so much fighting. See *Annals of the Four Masters*, at A.D. 718, 719, 721, 722, 727 and 728.

[4] He died about A.D. 738. An inscribed stone, existing at Clonmacnois in 1869, appears to have marked the spot where the Irish monarch was buried. See *Christian Inscriptions in the Irish Language*, by Petrie and Stokes, vol. i., p. 37. Dublin, 1872.

jurisdiction. He therefore lost no opportunity of urging the pretensions of the successor of Patrick.[1] In the year following his defeat of the King of Ulidia, he vanquished the King of Leinster and his allies in a great battle, and thus added largely to his power. He at once availed himself of the advantages of his improved position for carrying out his favourite ecclesiastical design. As he had meanwhile kept up friendly relations with the King of Munster, he managed to obtain his co-operation. At a personal interview, held at a place called "Tir-da-leth-glas" in Ormond,[2] the two monarchs discussed the arrangements to be made for advancing the yearly revenue of the patron saint; "and there they established the rule, law, and rent of Patrick over "Ireland."[3] It does not appear, however, that they found it practicable to carry their plans into immediate execution; but the scheme was now fairly launched, and only time and perseverance were required to secure its triumph.

Whilst the abbot of Armagh was rapidly augmenting his influence, the heads of rival monastic establishments were weakening each other by their contentions. In A.D. 763 the co-arbs of Ciaran and Columbkille disputed; the monks of their respective "families," as they were called, had recourse to arms; and after a sharp encounter in which "the family of Durrow" lost the day, two hundred of these tonsured warriors lay dead on the battle-field.[4] An entry in the Irish annals

[1] It is a significant fact that in the *Annals of the Four Masters*, Congas is the *first abbot of Armagh*, who is there called the Co-arb of Patrick. At A.D. 496 another individual is distinguished by the same title; but he does not seem to have been connected with Armagh. See King's *Memoir*, p. 16; and O'Donovan's *Annals*, i. 160, *note*. It would seem from this that the abbot of Armagh now claimed "co-arb of Patrick" as his peculiar and exclusive title.

[2] Keating's *History of Ireland*, by O'Mahony, p. 486. The place here indicated is now called Terryglass, and is in Lower Ormond. *Ibid.*

[3] Keating's *History of Ireland*, by O'Mahony, p. 486. See also King's *Memoir*, p. 32. Dr. Todd states that Amhalgaidh, who was abbot of Armagh from A.D. 1020 to A.D. 1050, was "the first prelate of Armagh who exercised jurisdiction over Munster."—*Introduction to Gaedhill and Gaill*, clxxxix, *note*. According to Keating "the rent of St. Patrick was established over Munster" about A.D. 827. See O'Mahony's *Keating*, p. 499. New York, 1866.

[4] See Todd's *St. Patrick*, p. 158. These facts, related by Tighernach and in the *Annals of Ulster*, are suppressed by the *Four Masters*.

at A.D. 778 reveals the steady expansion of the jurisdiction of the abbot of Armagh; for it is there stated that, with the concurrence of the King of Connaught, the *Cain Phatraig*, or the tribute claimed by the heir of Patrick, was collected at Croghan, in the parish of Elphin, county Roscommon.[1] Other circumstances indicate the growth of the great monastery of the Northern Co-arb. In this century several new offices were instituted in connection with it. We read now, for the first time, of the *bishop* as distinguished from the *abbot*,[2] and of the *prior* of Armagh.[3] Some of the abbots were married,[4] and some of them perhaps were laymen, so that a bishop became necessary to perform duties which the co-arb of Patrick had hitherto discharged.[5] The increasing engagements of the abbot called him frequently from home; and a prior was required to take his place during his absence.

The tribute paid to the co-arb of Patrick was originally a voluntary contribution; but it was demanded with greater assurance, when it was recommended by the chief monarch of Ireland. About this time the abbot of Armagh, like many others elsewhere in a similar position,[6] endeavoured to sustain his pretensions by the manufacture of forged documents. Towards the close of the eighth, or the beginning of the ninth century, some of these spurious title-deeds made their

[1] King's *Memoir*, p. 70. See also Archbishop Colton's *Visitation*, by Reeves. Preface, v-vii. The date mentioned in the text probably marks the first time that this tribute was paid in Connaught. For the meaning of *Cain Patraic* (or Phatraig) see Todd's *St. Patrick*, p. 485, *note*. In the *Book of Armagh* this tribute from the various provinces of the island is represented as "decreed to the rector of Armagh for ever."—Betham, ii. 410. Appendix, xlvi. Dr. Petrie maintains that the Cain Phatraig, spoken of in the text, relates to quite a different matter. See *Antiq. of Tara Hill*, p. 172-3.

[2] In the *Annals of the Four Masters*, at A.D. 793, it is stated that the bishop and the abbot "died on the same night."

[3] King's *Memoir*, p. 70.

[4] *Ibid.* pp. 69, 70.

[5] If the co-arb of Patrick, at an early period, conceived the idea of increasing his influence by courting the favour of the bishop of Rome, we can easily explain why he ceased to officiate in cases of ordination, and devolved that duty on the bishops who were subject to him.

[6] It is a curious fact that the False Decretals in support of papal pretensions, and the *Book of Armagh* with its false title deeds in support of the co-arb of Patrick, appeared in the same century.

appearance. The abbot had long before cherished the idea of challenging recognition as the highest ecclesiastical authority in Ireland; but about this period the claim is put forth accompanied by a long array of imposing credentials. Among others, the following canon was now produced:[1]—"If any case of extreme difficulty shall arise, and one which the various judges of the Irish tribes cannot decide, it ought properly to be referred to the chair of the archbishop of the Irish, that is, of Patrick, and be submitted to the examination of that prelate. But if there, by him and his wise men, a case of the aforesaid importance cannot easily be made up; we have decreed that it be sent to the Apostolic See, that is to say, to the chair of the apostle Peter, which has the authority of the city of Rome. The framers of this decree are Auxilius, Patrick, Secundinus, and Benignus."

We have here an illustration of the way in which ecclesiastical usurpation made its encroachments. The quotation just given is taken from a manuscript work still extant, which appears to have been written early in the ninth century, and which has of late obtained great celebrity under the designation of "THE BOOK OF ARMAGH."[2] The object of this compilation must be sufficiently obvious to any one by whom it is carefully examined. Along with a number of documents of undoubted authority, among which may be mentioned the New Testament itself, it presents to us a series of silly legends,

[1] "Item quaecumque causa valde difficilis exorta fuerit atque ignota cunctis Scotorum gentium judicibus, ad cathedram archiepiscopi Hibernensium, id est Patricii, atque hujus antistitis examinationem recte referenda. Si vero in illa cum suis sapientibus facile sanari not poterit talis causa prædictae negotionis, ad Sedem Apostolicam decrevimus esse mittendam, id est Petri Apostoli cathedram auctoritatem Romae Urbis habentem. Hi sunt qui de hoc decreverunt id est, Auxilius, Patricius, Secundinus, Benignus. Post vero exitum Patricii sancti alumni sui valde ejusdem libros conscripserunt."—*Book of Armagh. Book of the Angel.*

[2] The *Book of Armagh* was long considered one of the great muniments of the Primatial See. It was kept by a family named Mac-Maor, who held eight town lands, called the lands of Ballymore, from the co-arb of Patrick for its safe custody. In 1680 it was left in pledge with Mr. Arthur Brownlow for five pounds. Part of it was published in 1827 by Sir Wm. Betham. A new edition of the *Book of Armagh* by the most accomplished of Irish antiquarians—the very Rev. Dr. Reeves, Dean of Armagh—has been long expected.

all intended to prop up the pretensions of the co-arb of Patrick. The canon ascribed to Auxilius, Patrick, Secundinus, and Benignus, is a specimen of its impositions. According to another statement made in this same volume, the Apostle of Ireland, on the very eve of his departure from the earth, obtained a promise from heaven that "his jurisdiction should have its seat in Armagh;"[1] but we are here told that the matter had been settled long before in an Irish synod consisting of only four members. *The Book of Armagh* itself tells that Patrick ordained four hundred and fifty bishops in the island,[2] so that the paucity of attendance on this occasion is certainly rather suspicious. Other difficulties equally formidable stand in the way of the reception of the canon. According to the *Annals of the Four Masters*, Secundinus died exactly ten years before the foundation of Armagh,[3] and yet he here provides for the honour of "the chair" of Patrick as if it were a well-known institute. This canon was never before heard of in Irish ecclesiastical history; for at the Synod of Magh-Lene in A.D. 630—when the Southern clergy met to discuss the mode of keeping Easter—not one then proposed to refer the question to the arbitrament of the abbot of Armagh; and for upwards of eighty years afterwards, all the Irish ecclesiastics of the Columbian order acted in direct opposition to his example. The very title "Archbishop of the Irish" betrays the canon as a forgery. No such designation was known in the days of the Apostle of Hibernia. Nor is it the least awkward circumstance connected with this pretended ordinance that it is found in that part of the Armagh manuscript called the *Book of the Angel*—a document which professes to contain communications made to "Saint Patrick the bishop" by "the angel, the high-priest of the Lord."[4] It is not necessary that angels should convey the

[1] See Betham, ii. 339, and particularly Todd's *St. Patrick*, p. 490 and *note*.

[2] Betham's *Book of Armagh*, ii. 351.

[3] It is stated in these Annals that Secundinus died A.D. 447, and that Armagh was founded in A.D. 457. Lanigan places the founding of Armagh in A.D. 455 or 458, and affirms that Secundinus died long before that time. See his *Ecc. Hist.*, i. 271, 293, 313.

[4] Betham, ii. 407. Such fabrications as the *Book of Armagh* were not uncommon among the Irish in the Middle Ages. It has been alleged that the famous

revelations of ordinary history; and had the great abbot been able to produce terrestrial witnesses of a trustworthy character, he would not have sought vouchers among the hierarchy of heaven.

Other statements in this *Book of Armagh* clearly discover their true origin. When Patrick founded the city, according to a story which now obtained currency, he paid a visit to Rome, and stole from the Pope a number of relics to add to the sanctity of his Irish metropolis.[1] Among the articles thus pilfered was a cloth, said to be stained with the blood of the Redeemer. The *Book of Armagh* endorses this ridiculous tale. "We will now speak," says the *Book of the Angel*, "of the special reverence of Armagh, and of the honour due to the primate of that city. That city, indeed, was constituted free, *and the chief, by the angel of God*, and especially granted to that apostolic man, holy Patrick, the bishop. . . . . And that we should admire the goodness of God in all things, there is preserved in that holy place the most sacred blood of Jesus Christ the Redeemer of the human race, in the sacred cloth, together with the relics of the saints, in the eastern church, where the bodies of the pilgrims rest for a long time with Patrick,[2] and the bodies of those who lived beyond the sea, and other just men. *Therefore* it is not lawful, by reason of the aforesaid authority, that any prelate, abbot, or other person of any of the churches of the Irish, should appeal from the decision of him and his successors; for he has the jurisdiction, if cause should require it, over all the bishops and churches of the Irish." [3]

The appearance of these Irish decretals proclaims at once the increasing superstition of the age, and the increasing

---

Cormac Mac Culinan "manufactured the *Book of Rights* out of much older compilations, for the purpose of advancing, on the authority of ancient enactments, his own claims to sovereignty over the kings of the nation; hence Victor, the angel of Patrick, is made to prophesy that the grandeur and supremacy of Eire (Ireland) would be perpetually at Cashel." *Proceedings &c. of the Kilkenny and S.E. of Ireland Archæological Society*, vol. v., part ii., p. 239. New series, 1865.

[1] This story is told in the *Tripartite Life*. See Todd's *St. Patrick*, pp. 481-2.

[2] This is a palpable untruth, as it was notorious that Patrick was buried at Downpatrick.

[3] Betham, ii 411-412.

assumptions of the co-arb of Patrick. A very small amount of critical skill would have been sufficient to detect their gross imposture. Even at the close of the eighth century, there were perhaps scholars in Ireland who could have exposed the deception; but no one seems to have been willing to incur the wrath of the most powerful churchman in the kingdom by engaging in the invidious office. The manufacturer of the documents, whoever he may have been, was permitted to pass unchallenged. For a time the abbot of Armagh seems to have prudently employed them rather for show than service; and, as little practical use was made of them, there was the less temptation to scrutinize their claims. Neither in the ninth nor tenth century is there any instance of an appeal from the church of Ireland to Rome. During the same period there is no proof that the spiritual supremacy of Armagh was recognized throughout Ireland.

The fact of the appearance of the canon ascribed to Auxilius, Patrick, Secundinus and Benignus, in a volume which was understood to contain the title-deeds of the See of Armagh, attests that the abbot was already prepared to acknowledge the papal supremacy. If he could but secure his own ecclesiastical pre-eminence in Ireland, he was willing to submit to the claims of the Bishop of Rome. It is highly probable that either the great western patriarch himself, or some of his representatives in South Britain, had already suggested such a compromise; and if, as is asserted, Charlemagne corresponded with the Irish kings,[1] so zealous an advocate for the extension of the Roman ritual must have encouraged the project. In the veneration for relics, which now shows itself unequivocally in the Church of Ireland, we see the development of one species of those absurd superstitions which the Bishop of Rome had long before inculcated and patronized. The famous crozier, known as *the staff of Jesus*,[2] now first emerges from

[1] See before, p. 100, *note* (6).

[2] This celebrated crozier was covered with gold and adorned with precious stones. To convince the people, at the time of the reformation, of the folly of their ideas respecting it, it was thrown into the fire publicly, by order of Government, and was found to burn like ordinary lumber. At one period another supposed relic of the Irish apostle—the *Buachach-Phatraic* probably a cap or

obscurity. The ignorant multitude greedily swallowed the idle tales told of this pretended memorial of the Apostle of Hibernia. It was affirmed that Patrick, when in an island in the Tyrrhene sea, had received it from a hermit, to whom it had been given by Christ himself; it was compared to the rod of Moses, and was supposed to possess marvellous virtue; and, so long as the abbot of Armagh retained possession of this precious badge of official authority, he was believed to be able to produce tangible proof of his commission from heaven. Among the notable events of the eighth century, the profanation of the holy staff is carefully recorded.[1]

In the eighth century, the growing intercourse of the monks of Ireland with the monks of England and the continent, had obviously an injurious effect on the spiritual character of Hibernian churchmen. The love of truth, so essential to high principle, was now very much on the decline; and too many regarded a pious fraud, adroitly managed, as a laudable performance. It cannot, however, be denied that Irishmen were otherwise improved by their visits to France and Italy. Their minds were stimulated, and their general information much enlarged, by the sights and society of foreign countries. And though, in consequence of the prevalence of monachism, many of the Irish people lived in a very barbarous state—for the clergy, instead of diffusing any light which they possessed by spreading themselves all over the country, kept together in their convents—the Western isle was not behind neighbouring nations in the arts of civilization. Long before this time, it could exhibit proofs of its superiority in various kinds of workmanship. The elegant dresses and golden ornaments of persons of distinction attested the taste and skill of the native manufacturers. Irish ecclesiastics often employed themselves in making bells, croziers, and articles of church furniture: and in the writing and ornamentation

mitre, was greatly venerated in Ireland. In O'Donovan's *Annals of the Four Masters* (iv. 791, at A.D. 1406) we are told that "*the chief relic of Connaught*, the Buachach-Patraig, which had been preserved at Elphin, was taken from the English."

1 "A.D. 784, the profanation of the Bachall Isa (staff of Jesus) and the relics of Patrick by Donnchadh, son of Domnall, at Rath-airthir, at the fair." *Annals*

of manuscripts, their ability was almost unrivalled.[1] The remains of ancient Irish churches—said to be the oldest memorials of the kind in Northern Europe—still excite the curiosity of the antiquarian. The earliest buildings for Christian worship erected in the island appear to have been of a very rude character. Constructed of mud, or wattles, or timber roughly put together, and covered with reeds or rushes, they were generally small, unsightly, and uncomfortable. Some of them may have been of stone, built in what has been called the Cyclopean style of architecture.[2] In the seventh century, churches of stone, formed after tasteful continental models, began to appear in various parts of England: these soon attracted the notice and admiration of Hibernian visitors; and in due time were reproduced in this country. We have indisputable evidence that stone churches—some of them of no little artistic excellence—existed here in the eighth century.[3] But whether these ornate buildings were not old

---

the Four Masters. Donagh Mac Daniel had, it appears, sworn falsely on these relics. The custom of swearing on the holy evangelists is said to have been unknown in Ireland before the time of the English invasion, in the reign of Henry II. Archbishop Colton's *Visitation*, by Reeves, p. 44, *note*.

[1] *Life of Petrie*, by Stokes, p. 172. It has been remarked of the Irish monastery of St. Gall, in Switzerland, that "scarcely was there any other establishment so celebrated for the beauty of its manuscripts, nor did any other so highly prize the art, or devolop, with such care and labour, the ornamentation of initial letters." Ulster *Journal of Archæology*, vol. vii., p. 237.

[2] Circular enclosures usually encompassed the group of buildings constituting the very early ecclesiastical establishments in Ireland. "These circumvallations, which were but imitations of the sorts of fortress in use among the pagan Irish, were sometimes of stone, and sometimes simply of earth; at other times of stone intermixed with earth, and occasionally of earth faced with stone, and they were all more or less circular in their plan. When of earth only, they were denominated by the terms *Rath* or *Lis*, words synonymous with each other; and when of stone, or of earth faced with stone, they were denominated *Cathair*, or more usually *Caisel*, words also synonymous; and all these terms had been applied by the pagan Irish to their fortresses of earth and stone; and I may add that the term *Dun* was applied indifferently to both."—Petrie's *Ecc. Archit. of Ireland*, p. 445. After all that Dr. Petrie has written on the subject, some contend that the oldest stone buildings found in the country are of pagan origin, and date long before the Christian era. Such, they say, are some of the earliest Christian churches. See Keane's *Towers and Temples of Ancient Ireland*. Dublin, 1867.

[3] See Petrie's *Ecc. Architecture of Ireland*, pp. 142, 197-204.

pagan temples adapted to Christian worship, is a question which yet awaits a very satisfactory solution.[1]

The Round Towers of Ireland, like the Pyramids of Egypt, have long supplied a theme for discussion to antiquarians. They are hollow cylinders, constructed of neatly-jointed stonework, roofed with the same substantial covering, and narrowing as they approach the summit. These towers are from forty to sixty feet in circumference at the base; from fifty to one hundred and fifty feet high;[2] and divided internally into several stories. They are entered each by a door elevated from eight to thirty feet above the level of the ground, and so narrow that only one person at a time can obtain admission. The uppermost story has three, four, five, six, or more apertures—in several instances arranged without any reference to the points of the compass.[3] The intermediate stories—amounting sometimes to six or more in number—are each lighted by a single aperture.[4] It would appear that some of these edifices supplied points of elevation whence the monastic bell summoned the surrounding population to the house of God;[5] and served as places of security,

[1] Thus, according to Keane (*Towers and Temples of Ancient Ireland*, p. 325), the Abbey of Boyle is an "ancient temple converted into a Christian building in the twelfth century." Such also is the view he takes of Cormac's chapel at Cashel. *Ibid.* p. 322. This chapel "is small in dimensions, yet more costly by far in proportion to its size than any ancient church or cathedral ever erected in Ireland since the conquest by England." It is a church "in design and construction, unlike any ancient church in Christendom, whose building can be proved to date within the Christian era." *Ibid.* p. 13.

[2] The Rev. Richard Smiddy, in a recently published work (*Essay on Druids, Churches, and Round Towers.* Dublin, 1871.) maintains that these towers are ancient baptisteries; but this theory is certainly as unsatisfactory as any other yet suggested. Mere baptisteries would not have been places of such strength and altitude.

[3] Petrie's *Ecc. Architecture of Ireland*, p. 361. "The lowest story, or rather its place, is sometimes composed of solid masonry; and when not so, it has never any aperture to light it. The wall, towards the base, is never less than three feet in thickness, but is usually more." *Ibid.* Many of the round towers are in low situations.

[4] Petrie, p. 361.

[5] The buildings themselves in several cases supply evidence that the putting up of the bell was an afterthought, as the walls have been injured by the alterations thus rendered necessary. See Ulster *Journal of Archæology*, vol. viii. 287. We

where the church valuables could be deposited, and where the clergy could find refuge in times of peril or alarm. It may be also that, on critical occasions, their higher apartments were lighted up as beacons to guide the movements of friends at a distance, or were used as watch-towers to oversee the proceedings of the tribes in the neighbourhood. But it is not so evident that such was their original destination. Those who maintain that they are remnants of a civilization which existed in the country long before the Christian era,[1] and that they were merely utilized by the church, can support their views by plausible, if not conclusive, arguments. It is alleged, by those who contend for their Christian origin, that they were all at one period connected with churches[2] or other ecclesiastical erections; and yet it seems strange that, in so many instances, these associated structures have entirely disappeared, whilst such a number of the round towers,[3] in a wonderful state of preservation, still exist in isolated and

read in the Irish annals of the burning of *cloictheachs*, or bell-houses; but it is not easy to understand how the round towers could be burned: as the outside walls and the floors between the stories were of stone. *Ibid.* vol. vii. 161. Smiddy maintains that *cloictheachs* and *cloigteachs* are not to be confounded. By *cloictheach* he understands the house of stone; by *cloigtheach* the house of the bell. *Essay*, p. 199.

[1] Moore refers to this tradition in the well-known lines:—

"On Lough Neagh's bank as the fisherman strays,
When the clear cold eve's declining,
He sees the round towers of other days,
In the wave beneath him shining."

According to the old Irish annalists, Lough Neagh burst forth in the first century of the Christian era, and thus round towers and other buildings, standing on the ground it now occupies, were submerged. Keane contends that the round towers were built by the Tuath-de-Danaans.

[2] Such is the positive statement of Dr. Petrie, *Ecc. Archit.*, p. 34; but he has failed in the proof. It is significant that in a variety of instances we find a church belfry beside a round tower. See Ulster *Journal of Archæology*, vol. ix. 175. Petrie's whole argument is based on the assumption that a *cloictheach* is a round tower; but he has not convinced some of the most competent of our antiquarians that he has established this point.

[3] "About 120 of these towers are known to have existed in Ireland, and ninety of them still remain in various stages of decay, with the exception of a few still perfect to the very coping-stone of the roof." Ulster *Journal of Archæology*, vol. iii., p. 17. Belfast, 1855.

hoary dignity. And if the figures exhibited on some of them are heathen symbols,[1] we have thus an additional evidence of their pagan foundation.[2]

The appearance of memorials of gentile worship on some of the round towers, as well as on certain very ancient crosses, is all the more remarkable, as images were not introduced into the Irish churches until the tenth or eleventh century.[3] It may be that at an earlier date some pictures were displayed on the walls of a few of the more elegant temples; but it would seem that these were not intended to represent either saints or celestial beings, and that they were regarded as mere ornaments.[4] Some maintain that the sacred edifices so embellished had been used by the natives in the

[1] An awkward human figure—strangely mistaken by some for a likeness of the Saviour on the cross—over the doorway of the Round Tower of Donoughmore, County Meath, is probably a pagan symbol. See Keane, pp. 307, 161, 162. A hideous idol, two feet six inches in height, was dug up some years ago near the base of the Round Tower at Cashel. See Keane, p. 33. After stoutly contending for the pagan origin of the Round Towers, Dr. Lanigan adds:—"The strongest argument I meet with for the building of any Round Tower, according to the ancient fashion in Christian times, is furnished by that of Brechin in Scotland, which has over one of the two arches on its western front a figure of our Saviour on the cross, and between both arches two small statues of the blessed Virgin and St John. . . . . If these figures were placed there at the time of its erection, it is evident that it must be assigned to a Christian period. *But might they not have been added long after the original building of the tower*, and after it was applied to some Christian purpose?"—*Ecc. Hist.* iv. 414. The conjecture thrown out by Lanigan seems to rest on a good foundation, as the figure of our Lord on the cross over the door of the Brechin Tower and the other two figures connected with it, are certainly not at all in harmony with the surrounding symbols. See Ledwich's *Antiquities*, p. 162. Plate xvi. What has been called a cross above the doorway of Antrim Round Tower is apparently nothing of the kind. See Keane, pp. 309, 119.

[2] The late Professor Kelly, of Maynooth, who adopted the views of Dr. Petrie in reference to the round towers, makes incidentally the important admission that "in some of the oldest lives of St. Patrick, the Druids are introduced as predicting the advent of a foreigner who would substitute quadrangular *for the round pagan buildings*."—*Dissertations on Irish Church History*, p. 176.

[3] See *Life of Petrie*, by Stokes, p. 297. Dr. Petrie, so often quoted in these pages, was one of the most amiable of men. He died in his 75th year, in January, 1866.

[4] Various drawings of these "images," as they are called by Cogitosus in his *Life of Brigid*—representing birds, dogs and other animals—may be seen in Keane, pp. 32, 33, 34, 133. It may here be added that the "Red Hand" of Ireland is a pagan symbol to be met with in some Eastern countries. See Keane, pp. 136, 137.

days of their paganism, as their high places of devotion;[1] and that they were transferred to the Church when Christianity was established. If so, the old traditions of the country relating to its advanced civilization, long before the arrival of the national apostle, must be worthy of a larger amount of credit than has been generally assigned to them.

There is no evidence that instrumental music was employed in the services of the primitive Church. Some of the early fathers condemn its use;[2] and, at a time when Christians were obliged to meet together secretly for spiritual fellowship, it was not to be expected that they would care for a perilous accompaniment not essential to the celebration of their simple ritual. But at length they found themselves in more comfortable circumstances; and they then sought to render their worship more attractive. Ireland was probably one of the first countries in Europe in which instrumental music was publicly employed in Christian devotion. A tradition —it may be of doubtful authority—gives a harp to Patrick;[3] but there is good evidence that some of the early Irish clergy delighted in its minstrelsy, and reckoned their skill as harpers among their most valued personal accomplishments.[4] In pious households the sound of the harp might be heard accompanying the song of praise when the family assembled for religious exercises.[5] The Irish poet still

[1] It is a curious fact that the figure of a cow or ox—an object of pagan worship—appears above what is known as the South doorway of Cormac's Chapel, at Cashel. See Keane, p. 148. Even some of the most venerated old crosses, still extant in Ireland, betray their heathen origin. Thus on the base of the cross at Kells, County Meath, are two centaurs. "The first is Kronos, the horned one—*i.e.* Osiris, and the second Sagittarius, the armour-bearer of Osiris."—Keane, p. 152. Keane maintains that some of the inscriptions on these crosses have been made long since the formation of the crosses themselves, pp. 299-302. It has been already stated that the symbol of the cross was in use among the heathen many centuries before the Christian era. See before, p. 22, *note* (2).

[2] See Bingham's *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, vol. ii., p. 485. London, 1840.

[3] As to Patrick's harp, see *Petrie's Life*, by Stokes, p. 322. An ancient Irish author, who flourished before the English invasion, says that St. Kiaran's harp was preserved at Clonmacnois. *Columbanus ad Hibernos*, No. iv., p. 93, *note*.

[4] Giraldus Cambrensis says:—"Episcopi et Abbates, et sancti in Hibernia viri, citharas circumferre et in eas modulando pie delectari consueverunt."

[5] In Mac Firbis's *Annals*, at A.D. 720, an Irish prince is represented as coming

kindles into enthusiasm when he tells of the harp of his country

> "that once through Tara's hall
> The soul of music shed;"

and we can well believe that the clergy, who could play skilfully on the favourite instrument, were not slow to add its fascinations to "the grave sweet melody" of the great congregation. In their offices they were accustomed to the repetition of the Psalms; and it never appears to have occurred to them that they were not at liberty literally to comply with the commandment, "Sing unto the Lord with thanksgiving: sing praise *upon the harp* unto our God."[1]

"to the private house in which his younger son was lodged, and he remained listening to what was going on in that house; but he heard nothing there but thanksgiving to God for all that they had received, *and gentle melodious harp-playing*, and songs of praise to the Lord being sung; and the King perceived that the fear and love of God were in that house."—*Fragments of Irish Annals*, p. 25. Dublin, 1860.

[1] Ps. cxlvii. 7.

CHAPTER VI.

FROM THE FIRST ATTACK OF THE NORTHMEN ON IRELAND TO THE DEATH OF BRIAN BORUMHA. A.D. 795 TO A.D. 1014.

THE invasion of Ireland by the Northmen inaugurated a new era in its ecclesiastical, as well as in its civil, history. According to the best authorities, the inroads of the Vikings[1] commenced about five or six years before the beginning of the ninth century. Ireland was not the only country attacked by these freebooters; as Scotland, England, and France shared in the misery created by their depredations. The unsettled state of the tribes on the borders of the Baltic, and the parts adjacent, accounts for their irruptions. For many years Charlemagne waged war against the Saxons, in the hope of compelling them, by brute force, to embrace the Gospel; and, though he thus succeeded in making many nominal converts, he drove multitudes far away towards the north, and inspired them with a deep detestation of Christianity. The expatriated warriors, necessitated to seek out new homes in Scandinavia, disturbed the aboriginal population; and led them to think of those daring maritime enterprizes which they subsequently prosecuted with so much energy and perseverance. The Vikings greatly excelled their contemporaries as hardy and skilful seamen. In vessels, some of which were of considerable size, they ventured across the most stormy seas; and landed suddenly, in large

[1] Vic signifies a bay or fiord. The coasts of the countries inhabited by the Northmen are fringed with such indentations. Vikings mean *Bays-men*, and not Sea-Kings, as has often been alleged.

numbers, on a foreign shore. The scattered inhabitants generally fled in terror at their approach; and, before a sufficient force could be collected to resist the aggression, the pirates had returned to their ships, laden with booty. But they were not long satisfied with these predatory expeditions. They could appreciate the advantages of a better climate, and a richer soil; and they soon conceived the idea of settling permanently in some of the countries which they visited.

The invaders were called *Lochlann*, that is, Lakelanders—a name differing little in meaning from Vikings, and indicating that they were the natives of a region abounding in loughs or fiords.[1] By the Irish they were also styled *Dubhgaill* and *Finngaill*, that is, *Black Strangers*, and *White Strangers*. The Danes were the Black Strangers, and were so called from the colour of their hair. For the same reason the Norwegians, and probably the Swedes, were designated White Strangers. The Danes, or Black Strangers, first commenced their attacks; as, according to the Irish annals, about A.D. 795 they devastated Rechrenn—by some identified with Rathlin on the north coast of the county of Antrim, and by others with Lambay, or Lamb Island, on the coast of the county of Dublin. At this time all the Northmen were pagans; and, if they had previously mingled with the Saxons driven out of Germany by Charlemagne, we may presume that their aversion to Christianity was embittered by this intercourse. The churches and monasteries suffered severely from their depredations. They were attracted to such places —partly, it may be, by a desire to signalise themselves as the assailants of the Christian faith—but, doubtless, still more by the prospect of the rich spoils they were sure to find there. In A.D. 802 they landed in Iona, and ravaged the island. Four years afterwards they returned, pillaged the monastery, and killed no less than sixty-eight of the brotherhood.[2] In

[1] The Northmen may be remembered in Ireland by the word fiord—now ford—appended to various names—such as Strangford, Carlingford, Waterford, and Wexford.

[2] *War of the Gaedhil with the Gaill*, by Todd, Introduction, xxxv. London, 1867. This work, published by the authority of the Lords Commissioners of Her

A.D. 807 they appeared on the West coast of Ireland; desolated the island of Inishmurry, off the coast of Sligo; and pushed their way inland as far as Roscommon. In A.D. 823 they arrived at Bangor; laid waste the surrounding plain; murdered the bishop and many of the clergy; and broke the shrine containing the relics of Comghall, the founder. In A.D. 832 they attacked Armagh thrice in one month;[1] and Turgesius, a Norwegian chief, established there the capital of his kingdom.[2] This Prince—the Thorgils, or Thorkils, of the Scandinavian Sagas[3]—reigned for years over Leath Cuinn, or the northern half of Ireland. Not satisfied with the power acquired in Ulster, he sought to extend his dominion by the conquest of Meath and Connaught. He meanwhile plundered Clonmacnois, Clonfert, and other monastic establishments. In A.D. 845 Maelsechlinn, or Malachy, King of Meath, contrived, by stratagem, to obtain possession of his person, and put him to death.[4] The natives immediately threw off the Danish yoke, and succeeded in asserting their independence.

Had Ireland been united under an able sovereign, it could easily have repelled the aggressions of the foreigners. But it was so distracted by domestic feuds, that it could not collect its strength, and offer a national resistance to these daring adventurers. Its five provinces of Ulster, Meath, Connaught, Leinster, and Munster, were, indeed, nominally subject to a

---

Majesty's Treasury, under the authority of the Master of the Rolls, and written originally in Irish, appears to have been composed shortly after the battle of Clontarf in A.D. 1014.

[1] "The ancient Irish had no walled towns. There were indeed in Ireland walled towns before the coming of the English, as Dublin, Limerick, Waterford, Wexford, and Cork; but they were built by the Easterlings" [or Northmen].—WARE's *Antiquities*, chap. xxii.

[2] *War of the Gaedhil with the Gaill*, Introd. xxxvi. xlii.

[3] *Ibid.* lii. Some have thought that the romantic tales of Ireland, written shortly after this period, suggested the Sagas of the Northmen, as they are of precisely the same character. *Ibid.* xxviii. *note.* According to some, the celebrated Ragnar Lodbrok, or Hairybreeks, of Scandinavian story, is the same as Thorgils or Turgesius; but this is doubtful.

[4] He was drowned by order of Malachy in Lough Owel, near Mullingar, in Westmeath. It has been thought that Turgesius contemplated the establishment of his own form of heathenism in Ireland. His wife Ota gave audiences or oracular answers, from the high altar of the principal church at Clonmacnois. Introd. to *Gaedhil and Gaill*, xlviii. xlix.

chief monarch; but his authority was frequently disputed; he had not sufficient power to exact prompt submission; and the petty potentates of the island were almost perpetually at war. Munster—formerly under the government of one king—was now divided into two parts, and ruled by two princes who were at variance; several hostile chiefs reigned in Ulster; and the other provinces were in much the same condition. Ambition and selfishness extinguished patriotism; for the belligerents frequently sought to sustain themselves by appealing to the foreigners for assistance. This aid was readily supplied; and the Northmen fortified their position by entering into alliance with one or other of the native rulers. About half a century after their first appearance in the island, the strangers themselves disputed; and a terrible struggle commenced between the Black and White Gentiles. In A.D. 852 a sea-fight, which was kept up for three days and three nights, took place at Carlingford; and the Danes, in the end, are reported to have come off victorious. Dublin was selected as the head-quarters of the foreigners;[1] and, shortly afterwards, Amlaff, or Olav—a northern chief of high birth and distinguished valour—assumed the title of king.

The arrival of the foreigners, and especially their attacks on the religious establishments, proved exceedingly disheartening to Irish churchmen. Some of them left the country, and sought an asylum in other lands. Early in the ninth century we read of Irish bishops in Germany and elsewhere, who were regarded with very little favour by the dignified clergy of the places which they visited. The continental prelates, many of whom had large territorial possessions, and ranked with the higher nobility, could not brook

[1] It was called "Dublinn of Athcliath," that is, "the black pool of the ford of hurdles." A fort was built there by the Northmen as early as A.D. 842. *Gaedhil and Gaill*, Introd. lxxviii. There was a bishop at Athcliath, or, Dublin—a bishop at Clondalkin, about five miles distant—and a bishop at Glendalough in the same neighbourhood. Lanigan, iii. 228. Dr. Lanigan asserts that Sedulius, who died A.D. 786,—and who is not to be confounded with Sedulius, the commentator—is the only bishop to whom Dublin can lay claim before the eleventh century; but he thus speaks without proof. The fact that no other bishop is *mentioned* in connection with the place is no evidence that no other bishop existed.

the idea that these poor Hibernians were their ecclesiastical peers. The Council of Châlons sur Saone, held in A.D. 813, pronounced their ordinations null and void; and resolved not to acknowledge the presbyters and deacons admitted by them into the ministry.[1] The Council of Celcyth, held in England in A.D. 816, adopted a still more sweeping resolution. The Anglican fathers decreed that none should receive even baptism or the eucharist from Irish clergymen, "because," said they,[2] "we cannot tell by whom they have been ordained, or whether they have been ordained at all. We know it is enjoined in the canons that no bishop or presbyter should attempt to enter another's parish without the consent of its own bishop. So much the more is it to be condemned to accept the ministrations of religion from those of other nations *who have no order of metropolitans*, and who have no regard for such functionaries."

This canon was enacted upwards of two hundred years after the time when Augustine and his forty Romish monks had commenced the conversion of England. There had meanwhile been much intercourse between Great Britain and the sister island, so that the Anglican divines must have been well acquainted with Irish ecclesiastical arrangements. Their testimony to the non-existence of metropolitans in this country exactly accords with the statements of the native annals. We have seen that there was yet no such personage as the Archbishop of Armagh; but the co-arb of Patrick, the continuator of a long line of abbots, occupied a position of gradually increasing influence. It is clear from the canon of this Synod of Celcyth, that the Irish had now no hierarchy framed after the model of Rome. They neither had metro-

[1] Canon 43, Labbe, *Concil.* tom. vii. cols. 1281, 1282.

[2] Interdictum est ut nullus permittatur de genere Scotorum in alicujus diocesi sacrum sibi ministerium usurpare, neque ei consentire liceat ex sacro ordine aliquod attingere, vel ab eis accipere in baptismo, aut in celebratione missarum, vel etiam eucharistiam populo praebere, quia incertum est nobis, unde et an ab aliquo ordinentur. Scimus quomodo in canonibus praecipitur, ut nullus episcoporum [vel] presbyterorum invadere tentaverit alius parochiam, nisi cum consensu proprii episcopi. Tanto magis respuendum est ab alienis nationibus sacra ministeria percipere cum quibus nullus ordo metropolitanis, nec honor aliquis habeatur.—Cap. 5. WILKINS, *Concil*, i. 170, London, 1737.

politans, nor did they honour such functionaries. They differed in another point of very grave importance from almost all the other Churches of the West. They did not feel themselves bound by the canons of Councils held in Britain, France, Germany, Rome, or Constantinople. They had a Church polity of their own; and they were prepared to abide only by its provisions.

Nor are evidences wanting that the Irish Church of the ninth century cherished a purer faith than almost any other Church in Christendom. As we read of the almost endless quarrels of the petty rulers, we may be disposed to conclude that religion had very little influence on public morals; and yet, with the slender means of information we possess, we are to guard against too severe a judgment: we are to bear in mind that, in our own times of advanced civilization, and of evangelistic effort, litigation has not ceased; and we are farther to remember that, with us, controversies as to personal rights must be determined, not by battles, but by suits at law. Many of the feuds which disturbed Ireland are to be traced to its ill-balanced political constitution. The country was ruled by a multitude of little independent potentates; and the central government was too weak to enforce, with a steady and impartial hand, even laws to which all professed submission. Facts ever and anon present themselves to prove that, in the midst of much sensuality and barbarism, there were still some noble specimens of zeal, public spirit, and true piety.[1] The churches injured by the Northmen were often immediately repaired; and, in several cases, large donations must have been given by individuals for the restoration of these sacred edifices. Superstitions, rife in other countries, had as yet made little progress in the Isle of Saints. In the eighth century the Image Controversy created great excite-

[1] About this time flourished *Aengus the Culdee*, so called probably because of his devotional spirit, as Culdee signifies a servant of God, or a religious man. See Lanigan, iii. 246. He is said to have been abbot of Clonenagh or Disert Aengus; and he probably died about A.D. 819. *Ibid*, 246-249. He left behind him a *Festilogium*, a calendar written in Irish verse, in which he connects some saint's name with each day of the year. In this work the invocation of saints is perhaps more fully developed than it ever had been before in Ireland.

ment in Rome, Constantinople, and elsewhere; and the monks of Italy and the East were amongst the most strenuous abettors of idolatry; but this species of will-worship seems to have been hitherto almost unknown in Ireland.[1] Early in the ninth century Paschasius Radbert, a French monk, published a work in which he maintained the doctrine of Transubstantiation in its most offensive form. No Irish ecclesiastic had yet broached such a startling absurdity.[2] Various evidences of the doctrinal purity of the Hibernian Church at this period have been providentially preserved.

There is still extant a commentary on the epistles of Paul written by an Irishman named Shiel, or Sedulius, who is reported to have been abbot of Kildare in the early part of the ninth century.[3] The monastery of Kildare had long held a high place among the religious institutions of the country, as it had been founded by the celebrated Brigid, "the Mary of Ireland;" and its abbot may therefore be regarded as a trustworthy expositor of the theology of his native church. Sedulius, as his *Commentary* attests, was a writer of very

---

[1] It is well known that on this point Charlemagne opposed the Pope. In A.D. 794, he assembled a Council, at Frankfort-on-the-Main, which condemned the worship of images. There is reason to believe that the light supplied to him by the Irish doctors whom he then patronised contributed to this decision. See before, p. 99.

[2] It is repudiated even by a bishop of Rome of the fifth century. Thus Gelasius asserts that what we partake of in the Eucharist "does not cease to be the substance or nature of bread and wine." "Per eadem divinae efficimur participes naturae, *et tamen esse non desinit substantia vel natura panis et vini.*" In like manner Sedulius, an Irish poet of the same century, speaks of the sacramental elements as "the sweet meat of the seed of wheat, and the lovely drink of the pleasant vine." See Ussher's *Religion of the Ancient Irish*, chap. iv. Manchan, an Irish writer who appears to have flourished about the seventh or eighth century, says that "the breaking of the bread represents (figurat) the body broken by the soldiers on the Cross." In those days the bread was actually broken in presence of the communicants. See Dr. Reeves's *Paper*, read before the Royal Irish Academy, Jan. 13th, 1851, p. 23.

[3] Lanigan says: "That the author (of the Commentaries) was the Sedulius of Kildare seems unquestionable, particularly as he was living in 818, at which year, as marked by Hepidanus, (Hepidamnus?) the monk of St. Gall, a Sedulius Scotus (or Irishman) was greatly distinguished."—*Ecc. Hist.*, iii. 256. The Shiel, or O'Shiel family were long celebrated in Ireland as physicians. See O'Donovan's *Annals of the Four Masters*, i. 494, 495, *note.*

respectable attainments; he was acquainted with Greek, as well as Latin; he possessed some knowledge of Hebrew;[1] he had studied the works of the most eminent fathers who had preceded him; and in this publication he often avails himself of their aid. His commentary is generally distinguished by its good sense, its candour, and its evangelical spirit. The author is not without a tincture of superstition, and he occasionally betrays an attachment to monasticism; but any intelligent Protestant may read the work without finding much which he will severely condemn. Though he expounds the entire Epistle to the Romans, he *never once mentions the Pope*, or adverts to the spiritual supremacy of the ecclesiastical metropolis of Italy. He evidently considered that Paul was "not a whit behind the very chief of the Apostles;" for, in his commentary on the second chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians, he adverts in commendatory terms to his rebuke administered to Simon Barjona. "Not only," says he, "did the rest of the Apostles confer nothing on him, nor was he inferior to them; but he corrected something in Peter, who was the chief of the Apostles. Though otherwise they gave him the right hands of fellowship and peace, yet he resisted Peter, seeing that he acted contrary to the rule of the Gospel. . . . . For as his fault was committed before all, it should be condemned before all."[2] On the subject of Image Worship, Sedulius expresses himself with clearness and decision. Speaking of the wise men of the heathen, he declares that they erred "from the light of truth," thinking that they had found out a way in which "the invisible God might be worshipped by a visible image."[3] "To adore any other God save the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, is," says he, "the crime of impiety."[4] His annotations on Paul's account of the institution of the Lord's Supper are quite in harmony with the theology of the Reformation. "When our Lord said 'This do in remembrance of Me,' He left us,'

---

[1] See his Comment. on Rom. i. 1. The commentary of Sedulius may be found in Migne's *Patr. Curs.* tom. ciii.

[2] Comment. on Gal. ii. 11.

[3] Comment. on Rom. i. 21.

[4] Comment. on Rom. i. 23.

observes Sedulius,[1] "a memorial of Himself, just as one going abroad may leave behind some token to him whom he loves; that as often as he will look at it, he can call to remembrance his benefits and friendship." "We offer (*i. e.* celebrate) the Eucharist to keep us in remembrance of the Lord's Passion once, and of our salvation daily."[2] "It is called the cup of the Testament because it witnessed that the Passion was to take place a little afterwards, and now witnesses that it has been accomplished."[3] Commenting on the words of the Apostle "For we, being many, are one bread," he remarks: "For as bread is made up of many grains, so we, of many and faithful nations, are collected into the one body of Christ."[4] On the question of justification his statements are sound and judicious. "We conclude," says he, "that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law, as the thief who, when crucified with Christ, believed, and was justified."[5] "I will glory, not in my knowledge, but in the faith of the Cross, by which all my sins have been forgiven to me."[6] "As the soul is the life of the body, so faith is the life of the soul."[7] When commenting on Paul's direction that a bishop should be "the husband of one wife," he does not condemn the marriage of the clergy, though he apparently prefers a state of celibacy. He suggests that an individual who had been twice married, and who had lost both his wives when still a young man—provided he then remained single—might be fitter for the ministry than another who was only once married, and who still continued to live in wedlock.[8] He maintains farther that bishops are not an order of divine appointment, quoting, with approbation, the words of Jerome that "before, by the instigation of the devil, there were parties in religion, the churches were governed by the common council of the Presbyters."[9]

[1] Comment. on 1 Cor. xi. 24.

[2] Comment. on Heb. x. 3. "Nos vero in commemorationem Dominicae semel passionis, quotidie nostraeque salutis, offerimus."

[3] Comment. on 1 Cor. xi. 25.

[4] Comment. on 1 Cor. x. 17.

[5] Comment. on Rom. iii. 28.

[6] Comment. on Gal. vi. 14.

[7] Comment. on Heb. x. 38.

[8] Comment. on 1 Tim. iii. 2.

[9] Comment. on Titus, i. 7.

But at this period there were some Irish churchmen who did not cherish the same enlightened sentiments. Among these was a monk, named Dungal, who settled on the Continent. He describes himself as an "Hibernian exile."[1] He had, it appears, been obliged to leave his native country in consequence of the depredations of the Danes. He had some knowledge of astronomy; and in A.D. 811 he addressed a letter to Charlemagne in which he discusses—though certainly not with much ability—the two solar eclipses of the year preceding. Dungal had also a taste for poetry and general literature. He was one of those men who are more likely to follow in the wake of others than to guide the public mind. He was greatly influenced by the social atmosphere in which he moved; he had probably been connected with the Romanizing party before he left Ireland; and, during his intercourse with the monks of the Continent, he seems to have been completely won over to the superstitions which were then involving the Church in such spiritual darkness. About A.D. 823 he obtained a government appointment as a teacher at Pavia—where he succeeded Albin his countryman—and, a few years afterwards, he signalised himself by a defence of Image Worship and the Invocation of Saints, in opposition to Claudius, the far-famed Bishop of Turin. In this work he displays much learning, but little judgment. He has no difficulty in proving that the use of the sign of the cross had long prevailed, and that fathers of high repute had sanctioned the errors denounced by Claudius; but he utterly fails to show that his cause can be sustained by an appeal either to reason or to Scripture.

Claudius, whom Dungal assailed, was one of the most remarkable characters of his age. At a time when Biblical lore was very rare, he was noted for his skill as an expositor of the holy oracles; and at the earnest solicitation of his friends he wrote commentaries on various books of Scripture. In A.D. 817 he was appointed Bishop of Turin: he found his diocese overrun with the grossest superstition; and he imme-

[1] In the poem in praise of Charlemagne, attributed to Dungal, he is thus described. Lanigan, iii. 258.

diately set to work as a reformer. He removed the pictures from the churches; destroyed the images; condemned the use of crosses and crucifixes; denounced pilgrimages; and even challenged the supremacy of the Pope.[1] These proceedings exposed him to the attacks of a host of assailants; but, sustained by the support of many of the clergy and people of his diocese, he firmly maintained his position; and, after an episcopate of twenty-two years, died in A.D. 839, a bishop of the Catholic Church. He has by some been considered the father and founder of the Waldensian community; and, if the Church of the Valleys can lay claim to a higher antiquity, he probably did much to promote its growth; for he boldly advocated the principles for which it has been long a witness; and which, after the lapse of upwards of a thousand years, it still continues to uphold.

Some have maintained that this intrepid reformer was an Irishman,[2] that he was called Claudius Clement, and that he was the same as the Clement mentioned by the monk of St. Gall, when he tells of the two erudite Hibernians who arrived in France in the beginning of the reign of Charlemagne, and who contrived to win their way to the patronage of that illustrious sovereign.[3] This is unquestionably a mistake. Dungal, his theological opponent, who was evidently well acquainted with the history of the Bishop of Turin, must have known the fact, had he been one of his own countrymen. But he ignores any such relationship, and describes him as the disciple of Felix of Urgel, a Spanish bishop[4] of questionable orthodoxy. Jonas, of Orleans, an-

---

[1] See Reid's *Mosheim*, 301, *note*.

[2] This view has been ingeniously advocated by Mrs. Webb in her "*Annotations on Dr. D'Aubigne's Sketch of the Early British Church*," pp. 152-166, London 1857. In Ussher's *Sylloge*, (Epist. xix.) we have a letter with the superscription; "Claudii *Scoti* presbyteri ad Justum Abbatem." The superscription in perhaps the oldest MS. extant is very different: "Domino Sancto ac Beatissimo et mihi peculiari cultu affectuque specialiter excolendo patri Justo abbati *Claudius peccator*." See Migne, *Patr. Cursus.* tom. civ. 835. It is the opinion of some of our best authorities that the commentaries on Scripture often ascribed to Claudius, the Irishman, were written by Claudius of Turin.

[3] See before, p. 96.

[4] Thus Dungal says in the beginning of his reply. "The perverse disciple has not only tried to equal but even to excel his perverse and pestiferous master (Felix)

other contemporary writer who assailed his views again and again, describes him as by birth a Spaniard.[1] Clement, with whom he has been confounded, was considerably his senior;[2] but both were honoured with the patronage of the French Court, and both at one time taught in the same literary institute.[3] Claudius may have been led by his Hibernian friend to cherish those religious principles which have conferred on him such celebrity as one of the lights of the Dark Ages.[4]

That Irishmen were now distinguished as independent thinkers, is attested by those who cannot even be suspected of eulogizing them under the influence of any national prejudice. Mosheim, the accomplished Chancellor of the University of Göttingen, and one of the most accurate of church historians, bears testimony to this interesting fact. "The philosophy and logic taught in the European schools in this (the ninth) century scarcely deserved the name: yet," says he, "there were, in various places—and especially among the Irish—subtle and acute men who might, not improperly, be called philosophers."[5] When speaking of the century preceding, he employs language still more complimentary. "None," he observes, "but Irish scholars—in that age called Scots—employed philosophy—which others detested—in the explanation of religious doctrines."—"I was aware," he adds, "that Irishmen cultivated and amassed learning beyond the other nations of Europe in those dark times; that they

---

in mischief and blasphemy." See Migne, *Patr. Curs.* tom. cv. 466. Felix died in the early part of the ninth century. He held peculiar views regarding the Sonship of Christ.

[1] See his work *De Cultu Imaginum.* Praef. and lib. i.

[2] Clemens, who came to France about A.D. 772, was then probably at least thirty years of age; and Claudius, who was brought up under Felix of Urgel, seems to have been only a young man thirty years afterwards.

[3] This is admitted by Lanigan, *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 265. Claudius in this seminary explained the Scriptures, whilst Clement taught grammar and rhetoric. *Ibid.*

[4] Felix of Urgel is not known as an advocate of the principles professed by Claudius; but the Irish at this time were unfriendly to the use of images in worship, as well as opposed to the supremacy of the Pope. It is therefore highly probable that Claudius of Turin derived much of his theology from his Irish acquaintance.

[5] Mosheim's *Institutes of Ecc. Hist.*, cent. ix., part ii., c. iii. 7.

travelled over various countries of Europe for the purpose of learning, but still more for that of teaching; and that in this century and the following (the eighth and ninth) Irishmen or Scots were to be met with everywhere in France, Germany, and Italy, discharging the functions of teachers with applause. But I was long ignorant that Irishmen were also the first who taught scholastic theology in Europe."[1]

Various causes may be assigned for this intellectual superiority of the inhabitants of Ireland. In their schools of literature they enjoyed the advantages of a more complete education than the natives of perhaps any other country in the West; and when even the most famous Popes were not ashamed to confess their ignorance of the language of the New Testament, we meet with Irishmen acquainted with both Greek and Hebrew. Their knowledge of these tongues was applied to the interpretation of the Scriptures; and thus their minds were brought into close contact with the Great Source of spiritual intelligence. The man who understands his Bible can never be a slave. He has his information on the most important of all subjects direct from the Supreme Fountain of Wisdom; and no one can be able to overawe or overbear him by pretending to any higher illumination. The Irish were also encouraged in the exercise of free thought by the enjoyment of ecclesiastical liberty. The Pope was not yet able to intimidate them by the bolts of his spiritual thunder. They might admit that the bishop of Rome was indeed a personage of great dignity and influence; but they were convinced, with Columbanus, that he might sometimes require to be "instructed by his juniors;" and they had no idea whatever of believing according to his dictation. Hence it was that they were the leaders of thought among the scholars of Europe.

Of those in the ninth century who shone forth as stars in the firmament of the West, there was not one who, in intellectual splendour, could be compared with Johannes Scotus. We know little of the personal history of this true son of

[1] Mosheim, cent. viii., part ii., chap. iii., 6, and *note*.

genius. He was a native of Ireland;[1] but we cannot tell where he was born or brought up. His disposition was amiable; his morals irreproachable; and he was regarded by his contemporaries as a man of piety. He had a keen perception of the ridiculous, and he delighted in sallies of broad Irish humour; whilst his vivacity, eloquence, and learning rendered him a most cheerful, entertaining, and instructive companion. He was of small stature; but his pleasantry made his diminutive form always welcome, and added wonderfully to the attractions of his conversation. Like many others of his countrymen, he sought a home on the continent; and shortly before the middle of the ninth century was introduced to Charles the Bald. He soon commended himself so greatly to that prince, that he became a constant guest at the royal table. His power of quick *repartee* sometimes almost disturbed the monarch's equanimity. The king, it may be, was not very strictly temperate, according to more modern notions of sobriety; and one day, as his *protégé* sat opposite to him after dinner sipping his wine, Charles said to him by way of banter, "Now, John, what is the difference between a *Scot* and a *Sot?*"[2] "Nothing at all *but the table*, please your Majesty," was the ready reply of the little Irishman. On another occasion, at a royal banquet, a dish, containing one small fish and two of a larger size, were placed before him that he might divide them with two hungry and stalwart priests sitting at the same table. John gravely bisected the small fish, handed a moiety to each of his neighbours, and then took the two others to himself. The king soon heard of

[1] Some Scotch writers have maintained that he was born in their country, and that he was a native of *Ayr;* but, as Lanigan has well observed, Ayrshire was not then in Scotland, but in *Britain;* and in that age *Scotus* was everywhere understood as the designation of an Irishman. In the oldest MSS. he is called Johannes *Ierugena*, as well as Johannes Scotus. Ierugena (from ἱερὸς and γένος) means of saintly birth—apparently in allusion to the fact that he was a native of the Isle of Saints. See Migne, *Patr. Cursus*, cxxii. Proœmium xix. Some transcribers, not understanding this title, supposed it to be Erigena, or Eringena; and hence he has been called Johannes Scotus Erigena; but it appears that in the most ancient MS. extant he is called either Johannes Scotus or Johannes Ierugena.

[2] "Quid distat inter Sottum et Scottum?" *De Vita et Præceptis.* Auctore anonymo.—Migne, cxxii. 17.

the occurrence, and asked him why he appropriated such an unconscionable share. "How, please your Majesty," replied John, "could I have made a more equal dividend? for surely," said he, "two large and one small," pointing to himself, "are exactly equal to one small and two large," pointing to the priests."[1]

Considering the age in which he lived, the attainments of Scotus, as a linguist, were extraordinary. He was well acquainted with Greek as well as Latin; and he understood both Arabic and Hebrew.[2] He acquired great reputation by translating from Greek into Latin the works attributed to Dionysius the Areopagite; and he is said to have been the first who united the scholastic with the mystical theology. He was singularly acute and ingenious; but he was a better dialectician than a divine; and, in attempting to remove theological difficulties, he often neglected the landmarks of revealed truth, and wandered into wild speculations. In his great work *On the Division of Nature*, he incautiously travels into untrodden fields of thought—confounds God and the universe—and excogitates a system of Pantheism.[3] He affirms that the wickedness, as well as the punishments, of men and devils shall at length cease, and that all things shall be absorbed finally in the Deity. Though but a layman, he took a prominent part in various theological discussions; and in the controversy on the subject of Predestination, originated by Gotteschalcus, he strenuously opposed the doctrine of reprobation. Though often led into the region of the incomprehensible or obscure by the ardour with which he pursued his metaphysical investigations, and though not unfrequently ensnared by his love of theorizing, he could reason on questions of a different character with admirable precision and vigour. When Paschasius Radbert, abbot of Corbey in France, published the work to which we have already adverted in support of Transubstantiation, and dedicated it to

[1] *Ibid.*

[2] *Mosheim.* Reid's edition, p. 303, *note.*

[3] This work may be found in Migne's *Patrol. Cursus.*, tom. cxxii. Dr. Hodge, of Princeton, in his recent treatise on *Systematic Theology* (i. 77, 329), describes Scotus as "the most pronounced pantheist among the schoolmen."

Charles the Bald, the king was perplexed by a doctrine now for the first time presented in its naked absurdity; and, at the royal request, Scotus drew up a statement of his views on the disputed topic.

The Lord's Supper, as administered in the early Irish Church, had very little resemblance to the Sacrament of the Eucharist now dispensed according to the Romish ritual. In the days of Patrick, Columbkille, and Columbanus, the communicants did not partake kneeling,[1] neither was a wafer placed on the tongue by the officiating priest. The bread was broken by the minister[2] in presence of the congregation, handed to the participators, and by the recipients themselves conveyed to the mouth in the manner of ordinary food.[3] The cup in the old Irish Church was considered an essential part of the ordinance,[4] and the laity shared the wine as well as the bread. In the time of Adamnan, the holy Supper was known as "*The Sacrament* of the body and blood of Christ;" but, by way of abbreviation, it was often designated simply "The body and blood of Christ." It was still called "The Eucharist" or "The Thanksgiving," and its celebration was described as "*the breaking of bread.*" All evangelical Protestants believe that the Saviour is spiritually present to the true worshipper, and that, at the sacramental table, he partakes by faith of the body and blood of Christ.[5] Such also was the doctrine of the fathers of the ancient Church of Ireland. They taught that the true children of God enjoy a blessing when they join in the sacred feast; but they repudiated the idea

[1] The worshippers partook *standing* when the primitive practice of *sitting* was laid aside. The custom of *kneeling* in adoration of the host was not generally established until the thirteenth century. See Wilkins's *Concilia*, i. 267, 594.

[2] See Adamnan's *Columba*, i. 44. "Sanctum advocat, ut simul, quasi duo presbyteri, Dominicum panem frangerent."

[3] See *Labbei Concilia*, tom. ii. 1487. Venetiis, 1728.

[4] "As to the communion under both kinds," says Dr. Lanigan, "he (Ussher) might have saved himself the trouble of collecting passages concerning it; for *it is not denied that in old times it was practised in Ireland as well as everywhere else.*" *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 310.

[5] "The worthy receivers are, not after a corporal and carnal manner, but by faith made partakers of his body and blood."—*Shorter Catechism of Westminster Assembly.*—Answer to question 96.

that any ordinary church member is benefited by the mere *opus operatum* of communicating. Their views are beautifully expressed in a hymn of great antiquity, said to have been used at one time in the monastery of Bangor when the Eucharist was dispensed. It thus commences :—

"Approach, ye saints,
Take the body of Christ,
Drinking the sacred blood
By which ye have been redeemed.

"Saved by the body
And blood of Christ,
By which nourished,
Let us sing praise to God.

"By this *sacrament*
Of the body and blood,
All are rescued
From the jaws of hell.

"The Giver of Salvation,
Christ the Son of God,
Saved the world
By his cross and blood.

"For the whole world
The Lord was sacrificed,
He is at once
The priest and the victim.

"In the law it is commanded
To immolate victims,
By it are foreshadowed
Divine mysteries."[1]

It must, however, be admitted that phraseology was now currently employed for which we can produce no warrant in the New Testament. The Communion table was called "the altar;" the Eucharist was styled "the sacrifice;" and the minister who celebrated the ordinance was said "to make the body of Christ."[2] Such language was calculated to mislead;

---

[1] This hymn may be found in Part I. of the *Book of Hymns*, published by the Irish Archæological and Celtic Society, pp. 43-4. Dublin, 1855.

[2] See Adamnan's *Columba*, i. 44. "Jussus *Christi corpus ex more conficere.*" This phrase seems to have been in use even in the third century. Thus Tertullian

and it is extremely probable that many had already formed very erroneous conceptions of the nature of the Lord's Supper. Men of thought, such as Sedulius, regarded expressions in common use merely as figurative forms of speech; and there is evidence that both in England[1] and in Ireland, the true doctrine of the Eucharist was still understood. On the Continent there was, in many places, a wider departure from the simplicity of the Gospel; and yet even there, when Radbert broached his sentiments, many were startled by their extravagance. When Scotus, at the instigation of King Charles, undertook the exposition of the subject, he emphatically condemned the theology of the monk of Corbey. At home in Ireland he had certainly never heard such views propounded.[2] His clear mind revolted from the monstrous dogma of Transubstantiation; for he knew that He who has given us eyes to see and hands to feel would never require us to believe in opposition to the testimony of our senses. The

says:—"Christ having taken the bread and given it to his disciples *made it his own body* by saying:—'This is my body,' that is, *the figure of my body*." *Against Marcion*, lib. iv. c. 40.

[1] The well-known Homily of Elfric, who was archbishop of Canterbury in the latter part of the tenth century, supplies clear testimony on this subject. He there says:—"The body of Christ, which suffered and rose from the dead, is eternal and impassible, and no more subject to decay or death; whereas the Eucharist is not eternal, but corruptible, subject to the force of time, and divisible into many parts; it is ground by the teeth, and passes through the common channels of the body; but, notwithstanding, the spiritual efficacy of it remains in every part. . . . The sacrament is a type or pledge; but the body of our Lord Jesus Christ is the truth and the reality of the representation. God has vouchsafed to us this pledge or earnest, till we come to the truth itself, and then the pledge will disappear; for, as has been observed, the holy Eucharist is the body of Jesus Christ, not corporally but spiritually." See Hale's *Essays*, p. 416. In his *Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church* (second edition. Newcastle, 1810. p. 495.) Dr. Lingard asserts that Elfric is "chiefly remarkable for the *novelty* and *obscurity* of his language respecting the Eucharist." It must be plain from testimonies already given that the novelty was on the other side; and candid readers must acknowledge that the statement of the English archbishop is remarkably perspicuous.

[2] If the ancient treatise on the symbolical ceremonies of the mass, quoted by O'Curry (*Lectures*, p. 377), can claim a higher antiquity than the eleventh century, it has obviously been tampered with after the doctrine of Transubstantiation was developed in a dogmatic form. The words between "the body of Christ and his blood" (line 15) and "which the righteous consume off God's table" (line 24) are very like an interpolation.

work of Scotus is not now extant; but it created so much discussion at the time, and it is so distinctly noticed in the writings of contemporaries,[1] that we are left in no doubt as to his opinions in relation to the disputed question. He maintained that the sacramental elements are not converted by the act of consecration into the real body and blood of Christ, but that they are "the figure, the sign, the pledge, of his body and blood."[2] This avowal of his views drew down upon him at the time no sentence of ecclesiastical proscription; for he was thus only reiterating sentiments promulgated by some of the greatest fathers of the church;[3] and multitudes in his own days were not quite prepared for the astounding positions of the French abbot. But from this date the haze of superstition settled down on the public mind with increased density; and, about two hundred years afterwards, the doctrine of Scotus was condemned in several councils.[4] He has ever since been reputed a heretic by Roman Catholic writers.

It has been alleged by some that Scotus, when advanced in life, removed to England, where he was patronized by Alfred the Great. This is, however, a mistake, arising from confounding him with another individual of the same name—a Saxon monk named John—who flourished towards the close of the ninth century.[5] There is no evidence that Scotus ever returned to Ireland. He appears to have died in France about A.D. 874.[6]

Among the contemporaries of Scotus was Patrick, an Irish abbot, who passed over into England, and died at Glaston-

---

[1] Thus Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims, unquestionably alludes to him in his second treatise on Predestination when he speaks of certain parties who held "that the sacraments of the altar are not the true body and true blood of the Lord, but only the memorial of the body and blood." See Lanigan, iii. 303.

[2] See Migne, *Patrol. Curs.* cxxii. Procœmium, xxi. *De Vita et Præceptis*, 36.

[3] Such as Augustine and Chrysostom.

[4] Particularly in the Council of Vercelli held in A.D. 1050. See *Labbei Concilia*, tom. xi. 1433. Venetiis, 1730.

[5] This John, who was a priest as well as a monk, became abbot of Aetheling or Athelingey. See Alfred's *Life*, by Asserius. There was another John Scotus, bishop of Mecklenburgh, who was martyred A.D. 1065. See Lanigan, iii. 313.

[6] See Lanigan, iii. 315.

bury about A.D. 850. Some of the incidents of his life seem to have been transferred to the biography of his celebrated namesake,[1] though he lived at a distance of nearly four hundred years after the time of the Apostle of Ireland. The monastery of Glastonbury had evidently peculiar attractions for the natives of the Western Isle. Patrick Senior, the contemporary of the great Hibernian missionary, is said to have ended his days there, shortly after the middle of the fifth century.[2]

The number of high-born churchmen who now flourished can scarcely fail to arrest attention as a remarkable feature in the history of this period. Whether vital Christianity was much promoted by these great personages may fairly admit of doubt—for their proceedings were often strangely at variance with their clerical character; but their adoption of the sacred profession supplies proof that it was deemed highly honourable. We are told, for example, that Coenfeolad, bishop of Emly, was also King of Cashel.[3] In the Annals of Ulster at A.D. 873, we read of the death of Hugh Mac Fiangusa, bishop and scribe, who was Prince of Roscommon;[4] and, about ten years later, of the death of Muredach, abbot of Kildare, who was the son of a King of Leinster.[5] Olchobair, bishop of Emly and King of Munster, who died A.D. 850, displayed no little military skill. He defeated the Danes in no less than three great battles—in one of which, fought in A.D. 848, the foreigners lost twelve hundred men.[6] But by far the most famous of these royal churchmen was Cormac Mac-Culinan, bishop of Cashel, and King of Munster. The place of which he was pastor was the capital of the Southern Province—though he perhaps never ministered in the beautiful little chapel which bears his name,

---

1 Dr. Ledwich, who denied altogether the existence of the Apostle of Ireland, contends that nothing was ever heard of him before the time of this Patrick of Glastonbury. See his *Antiq. of Ireland*, p. 68, second edition. Dublin, 1803. Subsequent writers have clearly shown that his scepticism is without foundation.

2 See before, p. 16, *note* (3).

3 See Lanigan, iii. 322. He is said to have died A.D. 872.

4 See O'Donovan's *Annals of the Four Masters*, i. 519, *note*.

5 Lanigan, iii. 329.

6 *Ibid.*, iii. 275.

situate on the rock of Cashel.[1] He was of royal lineage; and, when upwards of sixty years of age, by one of those strange vicissitudes not uncommon in times of war and revolution, he was called to the throne.[2] Nor was he altogether unequal to the very difficult position he was required to occupy. The country was rent by civil discord; and he was soon attacked by a combination of kings—including the King of all Ireland, and the King of Leinster—who marched into his territory, and laid waste the whole country between Gowran and Limerick. But Cormac did not long permit the outrage to pass unpunished. In the following year he appeared in Leinster at the head of his troops; and, in a pitched battle, overthrew the hosts of his assailants. This victory seems to have stimulated his ambition, so that he resolved to assert his right to the sovereignty of the island. He followed up his success in Leinster by marching into Roscommon, and exacting pledges of submission from his defeated foes. Urged on by Flathertach, abbot of Inniscathy,[3] —a man of martial spirit and headstrong disposition—he was induced, some time afterwards, to undertake another expedition into Leinster to extort a disputed tribute: but he now encountered a most formidable opposition. In August A.D. 908 a decisive engagement took place at Ballaghmoon, in the Southern extremity of County Kildare;[4] and, after a desperate struggle, the army of Cormac was routed with great slaughter. He is said to have entered with extreme reluctance on this enterprise; for he had a presentiment that the issue would be disastrous. Nor was he mistaken; for, in addition

[1] This beautiful structure, according to the current belief, was erected in A.D. 1127 by another Cormac, who was also a bishop and a king. See Petrie's *Ecclesiastical Architecture*, pp. 290-312. But Keane maintains that the building is of Cuthite origin, and that Cormac merely repaired it, and fitted it up for Christian worship. The pagan symbols which ornament the elegant arches of its doorways certainly argue strongly in favour of his hypothesis. See his *Towers and Temples of Ancient Ireland*, pp. 73, 148, 152. Dublin, 1867.

[2] According to the *Annals of Innisfallen* he was born A.D. 837.

[3] See before, p. 108, *note* (3). This abbot seems to have now had very considerable territorial property.

[4] See Muircheartach's *Circuit of Ireland*, by Cormacan Eigeas, p. 38, *note*. Dublin, 1841.

to the destruction of a large portion of his army, he lost his own life in the battle.

Cormac Mac-Culinan is not an unfavourable specimen of the more influential Irish clergy in the beginning of the tenth century. The Psalter of Cashel,[1] and other works ascribed to him, indicate his taste for literature; whilst the honourable terms in which he is mentioned by the native annalists attest how much he was respected by his countrymen. He was of a gentle disposition, very attentive to the observances of religion,[2] and not without sagacity; but he wanted a firm and commanding will; and, in consequence, he yielded with too much facility to the promptings of rash and pertinacious counsellors. Before this time, the Irish clergy had been relieved from military service;[3] but some of them do not seem to have cared much for the exemption. As the abbots had considerable landed possessions, they took rank among the petty chiefs of the country; and, when war was proclaimed, they were ready to buckle on their armour, and to share in the bloody conflict. Among those who fell in the battle of Ballaghmoon were at least two of these reverend champions.[4] Cormac may have felt a strange incongruity between his episcopal and his kingly office; and as a minister of the gospel of peace, he must have bitterly bewailed the endless broils which then distracted Ireland; but when raised to the throne, he was obliged to give way to the necessity of circumstances; and sometimes, even in opposition to his better judgment, to follow the counsels of the impetuous spirits by whom he was surrounded.

Cormac occupied the throne only about seven years.

---

[1] For an account of the Psalter of Cashel, see *The Book of Rights*, printed for the Celtic Society. Introduction, p. xxii. Dublin, 1847. To Cormac is also attributed a Glossary or Etymological Dictionary.

[2] Though a bishop, he was married. His wife survived him; and was afterwards married no less than twice. See O'Donovan's *Annals of the Four Masters*, vol. ii. 573, *note;* p. 596, *note:* p. 597, *note;* p. 651, *note.*

[3] By a law made in A.D. 804. See before, p. 55. In A.D. 816, in a battle fought between the Monks of Taghmon and Ferns, 400 of the combatants were slain. Reeves's *Adamnan.* Add. notes, p. 255.

[4] Ailill, son of Eoghan, abbot of Trian Corcaighe, and Colman, abbot of Ceann-Eitigh. O'Donovan's *Four Masters*, ii. 56

Though his reign was so brief and so chequered by misfortune, it has been regarded, on the whole, as rather a bright spot in the history of the period. His lot was cast in evil days; but he appears to have won the admiration of his subjects by the wisdom of his general policy, the nobility of his spirit, and the equity of his administration. About this time, according to a native writer who flourished in the following century, "there was some rest to the men of Erin for a period of forty years without ravage of the foreigners."[1] This rest from foreign invasion is computed to have commenced about A.D. 875.[2] Iona had long before been attacked and pillaged by the Northmen; but the remains of Columbkille—reputed by far the most precious treasure in the island—had not yet been seized by the spoilers. For greater security these relics were now removed to Ireland[3] and deposited at Downpatrick. But though for forty years, no fresh swarms of foreigners landed on the coast, the natives meanwhile sustained no little injury from those who had already effected settlements in their country. In A.D. 888 the abbot and prior of Cloyne were slain by them; in A.D. 890 they plundered Kildare and Clonard; and in A.D. 893 they pillaged Armagh.[4] In A.D. 916 and A.D. 918 formidable fleets arrived in the harbour of Waterford—then selected as the head-quarters of the new comers. These invaders divided themselves into three companies, part stationing a garrison in Cork; part, another garrison at Iny in Kerry; and part, another at Glas-Linn, supposed to be a place on the river Shannon.[5] They are said to have plundered the whole of Munster, so that there was not a house left throughout a large portion of the

[1] *War of the Gaedhil with the Gaill*, p. 27.

[2] *Ibid.* Introduction. lxxvii., *note* 2.

[3] *Caedhil and Gaill.* Introd. lxxxiii. The removal took place about A.D. 878. According to the *Annals of the Four Masters* the date is A.D. 875. See also Lanigan, iii. 326. Brigid's remains are said to have been removed to Downpatrick some time before (Lanigan, iii. 326-7), perhaps about A.D. 836. See Lanigan, i. 379. We read in the *Annals of the Four Masters* that in A.D. 852 "the successor of Columbkille suffered martyrdom from the Saxons."

[4] *War of Gaedhil with Gaill.* Introd., lxxvi., *note.*

[5] *Ibid.* Introd. lxxxv.

country.[1] Additional armaments continued to arrive, but the island remained unconquered; and during the greater part of the tenth century, war was carried on, with various success, between the natives and the strangers. An entry in the *Annals of the Four Masters,* at A.D. 948, illustrates the recklessness with which the land was desolated. "The belfry of Slane was burned by the foreigners, full of relics and distinguished persons, together with Caeineachair,[2] Lector of Slane, and the crozier of the patron saint (Saint Erc), and a bell which was the best of bells." This belfry of Slane is supposed by some—perhaps erroneously—to have been one of the round towers of Ireland;[3] the "distinguished persons" who suffered this cruel death had obviously fled to it for protection; the Lector, who shared their fate, was the teacher of the theological school connected with the monastery;[4] and the fact that the "relics" are mentioned first in the catalogue of the things destroyed, indicates the growth of a puerile superstition.

In A.D. 980 Maelseachlain, or, as he is often called, Malachy II., became chief monarch of Ireland. This prince was brave, high-spirited, and enterprising; and it is of him the poet says:

> "Let Erin remember the days of old,
> Ere her faithless sons betrayed her;
> When Malachy wore the collar of gold,
> Which he won from her proud invader."[5]

---

[1] *Gaedhil and Gaill.* Introd. lxxxv.

[2] He is supposed to have been the same as Probus, author of one of the *Lives of Patrick*, the Apostle of Ireland. See Lanigan, iii. 371. See before, p. 15, *note* (3)

[3] See Petrie's *Ecc. Archit. of Ireland*, pp. 373-4. Dr. Lanigan argues that it must have been of wood; as, if it had been of stone, it could not have been burned. iii. 380. "I believe," says Keane, "that the Cloich Teach of Slane . . . . was a wooden bell-house, made after the fashion of the day; also that the Cloich Teach of Tuam Green, erected 964, as well as the thirty-two Cloich Teaches, said by one of his biographers to have been provided by King Brian Boru, were all bell-houses of wood. (See *Ulster Journal*, vol. ii. p. 67.) To suppose that King Brian, who has not left us a vestige of any of his palaces . . . . should have built thirty-two round towers, is simply absurd."—*Towers and Temples of Ancient Ireland*, p. 296.

[4] In the seventh century Dagobert, son of the King of Austrasia, is said to have been sent to this monastery for instruction. Lanigan, iii. 101.

[5] Moore's *Irish Melodies.* The *Annals of the Four Masters*, at A.D. 994, state

But the bard has here drawn quite too fair a picture of Ireland in the days of Malachy; for "faithless sons" had long before entered into compacts with the Northmen, and lent themselves to the betrayal of their country. Neither Malachy himself nor the bold Brian Boru, his rival and contemporary, is free from the imputation of seeking alliance with the strangers. Malachy was married to the widow of the Danish king of Dublin, and afterwards to one of the daughters of the same prince:[1] and Brian gave his own daughter in marriage to Sitric, one of the Danish leaders.[2] Nor can this Irish hero be defended against the charge of usurping the crown of Malachy. Brian was the head of the Dal Cais, one of the very bravest of the native tribes: he then became king of Mononia, or Munster; and, by successful valour, he contrived to attain the position of King of Leath Mogha, that is, of the southern half of Ireland. But he aspired to a still higher elevation; and about A.D. 1002 he compelled Malachy to surrender to him the sovereignty of the kingdom.[3] Thus, after upwards of five hundred years of almost continued possession of the regal dignity,[4] the Hy Nialls, or O'Neills, ceased to be the chief monarchs of the island.

But though Brian Boru[5] permitted his ambition to overcome his sense of duty, and reached the throne by means which we cannot justify, his reign of twelve years, as chief monarch of Ireland, was a period of prosperity and progress. He main-

---

that "the ring of Tomar and the sword of Carlus were carried away forcibly by Malachy from the foreigners of Ath-Cliath." (Dublin.) This ring, or "collar of gold," had been long preserved in Dublin, as an heir-loom, by the descendants of Tomar, or Tomrair, the Earl, Tanist of the King of Lochlann, who was killed near Castledermot, in A.D. 846. O'Donovan's *Annals*, ii. 733, *note*.

[1] *War of the Gaedhil with the Gaill*. Introd. cxlix., *note*.

[2] Ibid. Introd. cxlvii.

[3] After the death of Brian, Malachy recovered the sovereignty.

[4] According to some authorities, there were a few cases in which the succession was interrupted. See *Book of Rights*. Introduction, pp. xv-xvi. Celtic Society's publications. Dublin, 1847.

[5] Or Brian Borumha. He is said to have derived his name from Borumha, a remarkable fort about a mile north of Killaloe, where he resided. It appears that he kept there the cattle levied from Leinster, under the name of the Boromean tribute. *Gaedhil and Gaill*. Introd. clx., *note*.

tained a good system of police; and administered justice with so much vigilance and vigour, that, according to the boast of a contemporary, a lone woman travelled through the country from north to south, "carrying a ring of gold on a horse-rod," without being either robbed or insulted.[1] He erected bridges, constructed roads, strengthened fortifications, rebuilt churches, encouraged learning, and made provision for the purchase of books abroad—to supply the place of those which had been lost or destroyed.[2] He showed that he could cultivate the arts of peace, as well as direct the movements of the battle-field. But the tranquillity of his reign was disturbed by the King of Leinster—who was in some way offended when in attendance on Brian's court at Kincora, near Killaloe. Deeply irritated, he abruptly left the palace, hastened homewards, and secured the support, not only of his own immediate adherents, but of almost all the foreigners in the country. Brian, though labouring under the weight of years, prepared himself energetically to resist this formidable combination. The hostile armies met at Clontarf on Good Friday, A.D. 1014; and after a struggle, kept up with desperate pertinacity from sunrise to sunset, the troops of the chief monarch won the day. His years prevented him from engaging personally in the conflict; but, when in his tent almost alone about the close of the engagement, he was assailed by one of the enemy and killed. Thus he died, in the very arms of victory, in the eighty-eighth year of his age.[3]

The account of the manner in which Brian was occupied on this eventful day forms a very interesting episode connected with the history of the battle. Feeling that increasing infirmities unfitted him for active warfare, he retired to a spot

[1] *War of the Gaedhil with the Gaill*, p. 139. It is of her Moore says:—

"On she went, and her maiden smile
In safety lighted her round the green isle—
And blest for ever is she who relied
Upon Erin's honour and Erin's pride!"

[2] *War of the Gaedhil with the Gaill*, pp. 139-140.

[3] According to some authorities he was only seventy-three at the time of his death. See *Gaedhil with Gaill*. Introd. clxxxix., *note*. According to the *Four Masters* he was eighty-nine.

commanding a full view of the hostile armies; and, attended by only one youthful relative,[1] he employed himself in devotional exercises. A cushion was spread for him at the commencement of the struggle; and, kneeling down on it, he opened his Psalter, and recited fifty Psalms, fifty Litanies, and fifty Pater Nosters. He must have spent nearly four hours in this exercise. When he had finished, he desired his attendant to tell him how the conflict was proceeding. He was informed that it was raging with terrific fury, that the noise was if seven battalions were cutting down Tomar's adjoining wood;[2] but that the standard of his brave son Murrough was still proudly floating, and that multitudes of the foe were falling around it. Brian now resumed his devotions, reciting fifty other Psalms, fifty Litanies, and fifty Pater Nosters. Again he inquired what was the appearance of the battle-field. He was told that blood flowed profusely, that no man could determine to which side victory inclined, but that Murrough's standard was still seen, and that it was moving towards Dublin. "As long as that standard remains erect," said Brian, "it shall go well with the men of Erin." Once more he returned to his devotions, reciting fifty Litanies, fifty Pater Nosters, and fifty other Psalms, thus completing the rehearsal of the Psalter. When he now asked what was the aspect of the scene of conflict, he was informed that the private soldiers were cut down, and that only a few of the warriors survived. After performing prodigies of valour, his eldest son Murrough had been slain. When told that his standard had fallen, "Alas!" exclaimed the old hero, "Erin has now fallen with it; why should I wish to survive such losses, even should I obtain the sovereignty of the world?" At this moment a Northman chief, retiring from the battle-field, came unexpectedly on the royal tent: a fierce conflict ensued; and the king and his assailant perished in the struggle.

The description of the proceedings of Brian, on the day of

---

[1] Either a son or a nephew. The statement that this attendant was a horse-boy, named Latean or Laidin, is apparently untrue. See *War of Gaedhil with Gaill*, Introd. clxxxvii., *note*.

[2] This wood seems to have extended from the plain of Clontarf along the north side of the river Liffey to near Dublin. Introd. to *Gaedhil and Gaill*, clxxxvii., *note*.

his crowning victory and death, has been handed down apparently by a contemporary ;[1] and there is no good reason for doubting its substantial accuracy. It attests that the old monarch was no vain sceptic. We can scarcely regard him as a high specimen of Christian excellence ; and yet we must admit that he believed in the potency of prayer. But superstition was largely mingled with his worship. Though the Lord's Prayer is an inimitable model for the ordinary purposes of devotion, it is not exactly suitable for all emergencies. And yet, even at this intensely interesting crisis, some of its utterances might have been rehearsed by the aged king with the deepest emotion. As he repeated the words, "Thy will be done," he was reminded of the duty of resignation, whatever might be the issue of the struggle ; and as he added "For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory," he was taught that there was One on high who had victory and defeat at His disposal. Brian seems, withal, to have had a lurking impression that he was to be heard for his "much speaking ;" as the rehearsal of one hundred and fifty Pater Nosters on the day of the battle of Clontarf surely involved a vast amount of vain repetitions. The Litanies he used were, as we have reason to believe,[2] addresses to departed saints, seeking for their intercession ; and such petitions implied a want of faith in the all-sufficiency of the One great Advocate. But if Brian could enter into the spirit of the Psalms, he must have found in them, under all his anxieties, much that was seasonable and comforting. His Northmen assailants were the open foes of Christianity ; they had slaughtered the clergy ; and they had often rifled and destroyed the churches of the land. As the veteran warrior thought of "all that the enemy had done wickedly in the sanctuary," we can well believe that he repeated with peculiar fervour the words of the patriot king of Israel : "Plead my cause, O Lord, with them

---

1 The *War of Gaedhil with the Gaill*, in which the statement appears, seems to have been written shortly after this event. According to Dr. Todd its author was "probably a contemporary and follower, as he certainly was a strong partizan of King Brian Borumha."—*Gaedhil with Gaill*. Introd. xii.

2 *Orates*, that is, "prayers consisting of the words *ora*, or *orate pro nobis*." *War of Gaedhil with Gaill*, 196, *note*.

that strive with me, fight against them that fight against me. Take hold of shield and buckler, and stand up for mine help. . . . . Let God arise, let His enemies be scattered; let them also that hate Him, flee before Him. . . . . Wherefore should the heathen say, Where is their God? Let Him be known among the heathen in our sight by the revenging of the blood of thy servants which is shed. . . . . Give ear, O Shepherd of Israel, thou that leadest Joseph like a flock, thou that dwellest between the cherubim, shine forth. . . . . Turn us again, O God, and cause thy face to shine, and we shall be saved."[1]

The name of Brian Boru has long been a household word among his countrymen. How often have they repeated with enthusiasm the words of their favourite melody:—

"Remember the glories of Brian the brave,
Tho' the days of the hero are o'er;
Tho' lost to Mononia, and cold in the grave,
He returns to Kincora no more!"

Nor is it without reason that Irishmen delight to celebrate the exploits of this heroic sovereign. He is reported to have defeated the foreigners in no less than five-and-twenty battles.[2] At a time when the Northmen had contrived to wrest a large section of France from the successors of Charlemagne, and when Canute, the Dane, was all but king of England, Brian, though bowed down by age, encountered their united hosts at Clontarf, and gave them a decisive overthrow. They had at this time kept up their attacks on the island for upwards of two hundred years, and they had sometimes obtained a partial ascendency; but on this great day he triumphantly asserted the national independence. They more than once afterwards attempted to recover their power; but they were so crushed by this discomfiture, that they were never afterwards able to make any effective stand against the authority of the native princes. Many of them still remained in the country: some of them became distinguished as enterprising and prosperous

[1] Ps. xxxv. 1, 2; Ps. lxviii. 2; Ps. lxxix. 10; Ps. lxxx. 1, 3.
[2] *War of the Gaedhil with the Gaill*, p. 205.

merchants; and all of them eventually mingled with the rest of the population.

In the long interval between the first invasion of the Danes and the battle of Clontarf, there appears to have been little change in the ecclesiastical arrangements of Ireland. It is not improbable that at this period the whole service of the sanctuary was not always conducted in the vernacular tongue. Liturgies in Irish were, no doubt, still in use; but the Latin service, commenced in the monasteries, gradually found its way elsewhere. Latin was now the vehicle of church literature; and the commentaries of Sedulius are written in that language. Irishmen, long before, were noted for their skill in Latin verse; we know that they employed their talent in the composition of hymns; and some of these hymns were employed in the ritual of worship.[1] As yet Ireland was unacquainted with diocesan episcopacy; a bishop commonly ministered only to a single congregation; and metropolitans, properly so called, were unknown. But though Armagh was repeatedly plundered by the Northmen, the power of the co-arb of Patrick continually increased. His position became of so much consequence that its possession led to disputes which greatly disturbed the public peace; and, according to the *Annals of the Four Masters*, a battle was fought, in A.D. 825, in the parish of Kilmore, near Armagh, to decide the claims of rival candidates.[2] At this time the pretensions of the abbot were widely recognised; as, according to an entry in the same *Annals* at A.D. 822, "the law of Patrick was promulgated over Munster" by Felim, the king of that province, and by the bishop of Armagh. Two years later we read that "the law of Patrick was promulgated throughout the three divisions of Connaught."

The fables embodied in the *Book of Armagh* were soon widely circulated and believed. That remarkable volume appears to have been written about A.D. 807.[3] Though it

[1] Such as that already quoted, p. 142.

[2] According to the *Annals* the battle lasted three days. The chiefs of the great families in Ulster were arrayed on different sides. The possession of the co-arbship had been previously disputed. See O'Donovan's *Annals of the Four Masters*, i. 403.

[3] This is the opinion of Dr. Reeves. It may be that part of it is of later date. See before, p. 115.

contains a number of most valuable documents, including a "Latin version of the New Testament," and the "Confession of Patrick," it presents along with them, as we have seen, a collection of false and foolish legends framed apparently for no other purpose than to sustain the ambition of the great abbot. In an uncritical age they passed unchallenged; pride and policy united in giving them currency; and those, who might have been able to expose their claims, had not courage to attempt the hazardous undertaking. These spurious vouchers countenanced the supremacy of the Pope; and all who were anxious for a closer union with the great bishop of Italy, were prepared to accredit such credentials. Though the Irish Church yet acknowledged no subjection to the occupant of the so-called chair of Peter, pilgrimages to Rome began to be regarded with approval;[1] and various other signs of increasing degeneracy appeared. The authority of the abbot of Armagh advanced apace.[2] In A.D. 992 we read, for the first time, of his taking part in a coronation:—"Muireagan of Badoney,[3] successor of Patrick, went upon his visitation in Tyrone, and *conferred the degree of king* upon Aedh, son of Domhnall" (Hugh McDonnel).[4] Upwards of half a century before, the *Book of Armagh* was so precious in public estimation, that its investiture with a costly cover, by the king of Ireland, was deemed an event of sufficient importance to be noticed by the annalists.[5] When Brian Boru became chief monarch of the country, some probably apprehended that he would refuse to admit the superiority of the Great Northern Abbot, as he was himself a Munsterman by birth,

[1] Thus, in the *Annals of the Four Masters*, at A.D. 926, we read that "Celedbhaill, son of Scannal, went to Rome on his pilgrimage from the Abbacy of Bangor;" and at A.D. 927, that "Ferghil, abbot of Tir-de-ghlas (Terryglass), died at Rome on his pilgrimage."

[2] In the *Annals of Ulster*, at A.D. 923 or 924, the following entry appears:—"Muiredach, son of Domhnall, tanist abbot of Armagh, and chief stewart of the Southern Hy Niall, and successor of Buiti, the son of Bronach, *head of the Council of all the men of Bregia, laity and clergy*, departed this life."

[3] In the barony of Strabane. This was probably his birthplace.

[4] *Annals of the Four Masters.*

[5] *Ibid.* at A.D. 937. "Canoin-Phadraig was covered by Donnchadh, son of Flan, King of Ireland."

and as he had supplanted the O'Neills on the throne of Ireland. But the politic king deemed it unwise to disturb existing ecclesiastical arrangements; and accordingly, when he visited Armagh in A.D. 1004, he quieted the fears of the clergy of the place by endorsing their title-deeds, and presenting an offering of twenty ounces of gold. On that occasion his secretary made the following entry in the *Book of Armagh*: "St. Patrick, when ascending to heaven, commanded all the fruits of his labour, arising both from baptism and alms, to be brought to the apostolic city, which, in the Irish language, is called Ardmacha. I found it thus stated in the books of the Irish. I, that is to say, Calvus Perennis, wrote this in the sight of Brian, emperor of the Irish; and what I wrote, he confirmed for all kings with his seal of wax."[1] We strongly suspect that the old warrior could not write; and certainly his testimony, as to the truth of what is stated in the *Book of Armagh*, is not above challenge. But this attestation was highly satisfactory to the co-arb of Patrick; and was even of more monetary value than the golden gift by which it was accompanied. Ten years afterwards another tribute of distinction was paid to the place with which the name of the Apostle of Ireland was now indissolubly associated. When Brian died, conqueror at Clontarf, his body was carried to Armagh, and buried, with all honour, in "the Apostolic city."[2] By his last will, made on the battle-field, he bequeathed twelve-score cows to "the co-arb of Patrick and the fraternity of Armagh."[3]

---

[1] Betham's *Antiq. Res.*, part ii. 393-4. Dr. Reeves states that Calvus Perennis—in Irish "Maelsuthian"—was the confessor of Brian, and that his death is recorded in A.D. 1031. See appendix to *Report of H.M. Commissioners on the Revenues and Condition of the Established Church*, p. 102. Dublin, 1868. O'Curry says that Maelsuthian was "hereditary lay abbot" of the monastery of Inisfallen. *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Irish*, ii. 177. According to these statements Brian's soul-friend, or confessor, was a layman.

[2] *War of the Gaedhil with Gaill*, p. 211.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 201.

CHAPTER VII.

FROM THE DEATH OF BRIAN BORUMHA TO THE CLOSE OF THE SYNOD OF RATHBREASAIL. A.D. 1014–1110.

THOUGH the battle of Clontarf gave a death-blow to the Danish power in Ireland, the country still remained in an unsettled condition. Malachy II., whose place, as chief monarch, Brian Boru had usurped, immediately recovered his lost dignity; but the subordinate princes continued to carry on petty wars; and the central government was too weak to restore peace and enforce obedience. On the demise of Malachy, in A.D. 1022, anarchy increased. By usurping the supreme sovereignty, Brian had disturbed the order of succession to the crown; and subsequently it was found impossible to preserve it from violation. Immediately after the death of Malachy, the conflicting claims could not be adjusted: an arrangement was made for the establishment of a provisional government; and the chief power was placed, for a time, in the hands of an ecclesiastic named Corcoran, and Cuan O'Lochlan, a literary layman, styled "chief poet and antiquarian of Ireland."[1] Though so terribly shattered by

---

[1] Moore's *Ireland*, ii. 147; *Haverty*, p. 151. Gilla Modud, an Irish poet and chronologist, who lived in the twelfth century, states that "from the death of Malachy II., the legitimate monarchy of all Ireland departed from all families during seventy-two years, until the joint reigns of Murtogh O'Brian and Donnel MacLochlainn; during that time no Feis, or general assembly, so agreeable to the people, was held, because Ireland had no supreme King."—*Cambrensis Eversus* by GRATIANUS LUCIUS J(ohn Lynch), ii. 38, *note*, by Kelly. Dublin, 1850. See also *Book of Rights*. Introd., p. 42. Dublin, 1847, and O'Curry's *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Irish*, by Sullivan, vol. ii., p. 138. London, 1873.

the battle of Clontarf, the Northmen did not cease altogether to give trouble. By repeated efforts for the recovery of their power, they kept the natives in a state of disquietude.

But even in the dark days of the eleventh century, Ireland did not completely forfeit its literary renown. Its educational institutes were not indeed thronged with students, as they had been three or four centuries before; yet some of them continued to enjoy fame sufficient to attract foreigners to our shores. Sulgenus, who was afterwards bishop of St. David's, in Wales, is reported to have spent several years in this country in the study of the Holy Scriptures;[1] and English youths appear to have repaired occasionally to Armagh.[2] Nor are instances now wanting of Hibernians noted for their literary attainments. Marianus Scotus, or Maelmuire the Irishman,[3] was one of the most learned men of his generation. Leaving his native country in A.D. 1056, when about eight-and-twenty years of age, he connected himself with a monastic establishment at Cologne. He repaired from thence to Fulda, and removed finally to Mentz. His *Chronicle*, extending from the Creation to A.D. 1083, three years before his death, is a remarkable memorial of his great industry and extensive information. Tighernach, abbot of Clonmacnois, who was his contemporary, and who survived him two years, was also distinguished for erudition. His *Annals of Ireland*, extending from upwards of three centuries before the Christian era to A.D. 1088, the year of his death, are amongst the most valuable authorities we possess relating to the ancient history of our country. They are derived from earlier documents—some of which are carefully quoted: and they have been largely used

---

[1] Lanigan, iii. 490.

[2] *Ibid.* In the preceding century (the tenth) Cadroe, a scion of the royal family of the Scots of North Britain, was sent to Armagh for his education. Lanigan, iii. 396.

[3] Maelmuire means "servant of Mary." Marianus is said to be the earliest writer who applies the term *Scotia* to Scotland. Moore's *History of Ireland*, ii. 177. There was another Irishman of the same name who flourished in the eleventh century, and who settled at Ratisbon. See Lanigan, iv. 2, 3. There was still another connected with Ratisbon, who was tutor to Nicholas Breakspear, afterwards Pope Adrian IV. Lanigan, iv. 155, 6. *Cambrensis Eversus*, ii. 401.

by the Four Masters[1] who compiled the *Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland* in the seventeenth century.

But whilst we can point to Marianus Scotus, Tighernach, and a few others,[2] as proofs of the literary culture of Irishmen in the eleventh century, it must be admitted that evidences of intellectual and spiritual declension are everywhere apparent. Nor can this be deemed extraordinary. The country had been woefully disturbed by civil wars; and the depredations of the Northmen—kept up for more than two hundred years—had reduced many districts to desolation, and ruined not a few of the Irish seminaries. These calamities forced large numbers of Hibernian monks to go abroad; and, when residing on the continent, they adopted the views there current relative to the power of the Italian Pontiff, and imbibed a relish for Romish observances. The refugees meanwhile kept up a constant correspondence with their countrymen at home; Irish ecclesiastics were thus silently inoculated with the Church principles of Italy; and practices hitherto little known among them became quite fashionable. During the eleventh century, the Irish annals speak frequently of pilgrimages to Rome. Nor were these pilgrimages performed only by individuals of inferior condition: they were undertaken by men of the highest eminence, both in Church and State. In A.D. 1024, Fachtna, "the most distinguished abbot of the Irish, died at Rome, whither he had gone upon a pilgrimage."[3] In A.D. 1030, Flaith-Cheartach O'Neill—a scion of the royal family—went to Rome.[4] In A.D. 1064, Donnchadh, son of Brian Boru, a chief king of Munster, was deposed; and afterwards repaired to Rome, where he died.[5] The pilgrims, who

[1] The Four Masters were four learned Monks of the Franciscan monastery of Donegal who compiled the Annals now called after them. These Annals were commenced in 1632 and completed in 1636. Michael O'Clery was the chief of the Four Masters.

[2] Among these may be mentioned Elias, who was abbot of St. Martin's, at Cologne; Dubdaleth, who appears to have been abbot of Armagh; and Donald O'Heine, or O'Heney, of Cashel. See before, p. 47. See also Lanigan, iii. 441, 449, 455.

[3] *Annals of the Four Masters.* Fachtna was "lector and priest of Clonmacnois."

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] *Ibid.* Donald O'Brian appears to have been a very wicked prince. O'Conor states that he fled to Rome in A.D. 1047, and died there in 1064. *Historical Address*, part i., pp. 80-1.

returned to Ireland, did not fail to proclaim to admiring auditors the marvels they had witnessed in the ecclesiastical metropolis of Italy. Some of the Popes[1] who then flourished were monsters of iniquity, and Rome itself had very little claim to sanctity; but the strangers were too much occupied with their devotions to investigate the condition of the city; and, when there, they moved within something like a charmed circle, where they were not likely to hear of the abominations by which they were surrounded. They could listen to the Gregorian chant; they could enjoy the magnificent music; they could admire the pictures and the statuary; they could gaze on the splendid churches, and the rich vestments of the clergy; and, mingling with the crowd of *devotees*, they could treasure up tales of miracles and wonders. The accounts brought home by the dazzled pilgrims prepared the way for a closer connection between the Church of Ireland and the Church of Rome.

The conversion of the Northmen to Christianity contributed still farther to promote the influence of the Italian see in this country. The gospel had made some progress in Denmark as early as the ninth century; but it was not until the tenth that the people generally embraced it; and, about the same time, the Norwegians also were induced to submit to baptism. All these barbarians were gathered within the pale of the Christian Church by missionaries in alliance with Rome;[2] their countrymen in Ireland, with whom they were in constant communication, appear to have renounced paganism shortly after them;[3] and, as these Irish converts adopted the faith

[1] Theophylact, or Benedict IX., who was made Pope in A.D. 1033, sold the Popedom to his successor John Gratian, or Gregory VI.; and Benedict X., who was made Pope A.D. 1058, owed his election to bribery. After holding possession of Rome for nine months, the Council of Sutri deposed him. Murdock's *Mosheim*, by Soames, iii. 722.

[2] The Norwegians were brought over to Christianity by missionaries from England. These English missionaries were, of course, connected with Rome. See Reid's *Mosheim*, p. 327.

[3] Dr. Todd says that "the battle of Clontarf seems to have shaken the foundation of paganism among the Scandinavians of Ireland. . . . On the field of Clontarf the spells of heathendom were deemed to have been vanquished for ever by the superior power of the faith."—Introduction to *War of the Gaedhil with the Gaill*, p. cxcix.

and worship of their kinsmen in the North, they were ready, from the first, to acknowledge the supremacy of the Pope. They occupied the cities of Dublin, Waterford, and Limerick —then perhaps the three most important sea-ports in the kingdom—and in the eleventh century, or early in the twelfth, they elected bishops for all these places.[1] But, when they had chosen pastors, instead of applying for ordination to any of the native clergy, they addressed themselves to the Archbishop of Canterbury.[2] By him their bishops for several generations continued to be consecrated;[3] and, as he recognised the jurisdiction of the Sovereign Pontiff, a portion of the Irish Church was thus brought directly into subjection to Rome.

The revolution which occurred in South Britain in A.D. 1066 added considerably to the influence of the Northmen settled along the Irish seaboard. In that year William the Norman, by one decisive blow at the battle of Hastings, made himself master of England. The Northmen in Ireland, who regarded him as one of themselves, were delighted at his success; whilst the native Irish were disposed to view it with alarm. As he had accomplished his conquest under the sanction of the

[1] Malchus, the first bishop of Waterford, was ordained in A.D. 1096. See Lanigan, iv. 15. Gillebert, who seems have been previously a bishop, was settled at Limerick about A.D. 1105.

[2] The city of Dublin is said to have been subject to England towards the close of the tenth century. Pennies struck by English monarchs in Ireland with the name of Dublin are still extant—of Ethelred, A.D. 866; Edrad, A.D. 948; Edgar, A.D. 959; and one of Canute, A.D. 1017. Campbell's *Strictures on the Ecc. and Lit. History of Ireland*, pp. 222, 317. Dublin, 1789. This accounts for the original connection of the bishop of Dublin with the Archbishop of Canterbury.

[3] Keating states that they applied for consecration to the Archbishop of Canterbury, because otherwise they could not have secured the selection of the bishops to themselves. The native bishops would have permitted the Irish among them to join in the election, and thus they would have been outvoted. "Their reason . . . . was, because there would be no equality in the election if it were *left to the voice of the people* to decide between a man of their own nation and a man of the Gaelic (Irish) race, should both be candidates for the episcopal dignity; for, in such a case, *the majority of the voices of the people* would be given to the Gael (Irishman) in preference to any one of them."—O'Mahony's *Keating*, p. 598. It is thus abundantly clear that, in the old Irish Church, bishops were elected by the people.

Pope, his spiritual patron shared the glory of his triumph; and the great Italian Bishop soon afterwards turned his thoughts to Ireland, with a view to the enlargement of his jurisdiction. About A.D. 1084,[1] Gregory VII.—better known, perhaps, by the name of Hildebrand—addressed a letter to the king, clergy, and laity of Ireland, in which he boldly challenges their obedience. It is clear from the tone and manner of this communication that the writer was well aware of the novelty of the claim: and he does not pretend to say that it had ever before been made by any of his predecessors. He is at some pains to explain the grounds on which it is advanced; as he may have been aware that there were still not a few in Ireland ready to demur to the assertion that "to the blessed Peter and to his vicars, the whole world owes both obedience and reverence."[2] "This letter," says a Roman Catholic writer, "is much in the style of several others which he wrote to various kings and princes, for the purpose of claiming not only a spiritual, but likewise a temporal and political, superiority over all the kingdoms and principalities of Europe."[3] It may be added that Gregory here invites the king, clergy, and people of the country to appeal to him for the settlement of whatever matters may call for arbitration, and thus assigns no limit to the questions to be submitted to his tribunal. It does not appear that any answer was ever returned to this epistle.

Before this letter was written the celebrated Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury, had turned his attention to the state of the Irish Church. This prelate, who was noted for his dialectic skill and his proficiency in the scholastic theology, had taken an active part in the eucharistic controversy by opposing Berenger,[4] and maintaining the doctrine of transubstantiation.

[1] Kelly refers this letter to the year 1078. See *Cambrensis Evers.*, ii. 573, *note.*

[2] This letter is No. xxix. in Ussher's *Sylloge.* See his Works, by Elrington, iv. 498. See also O'Conor's *Historical Address,* p. 74, part i.

[3] Lanigan significantly adds:—"*Having insinuated his claim over Ireland,* he concludes with giving directions to Terdelvac (Turlogh) &c., to refer to him whatever affairs, the settling of which may require his assistance."—*Ecc. Hist. of Ireland,* iii. 484.

[4] Berenger was a Frenchman. He held something like what is now called consubstantiation. But there had been such a change in public sentiment since the

He was a native of Italy: he had afterwards settled in Normandy; and in A.D. 1070, had been promoted by William the Conqueror to the primatial See of England.[1] He soon perceived that, if he became the consecrator of the bishops of the principal maritime towns of Ireland,[2] he could exercise weighty influence; and, accordingly, he did not fail to make the most of his position. It was probably at his suggestion that Dublin claimed to be "*the metropolis* of the island of Hibernia"—as it is so described by the clergy and people of the place in a letter addressed to him, requesting him to ordain a certain presbyter named Patrick, whom they had chosen as their bishop.[3] In the profession of obedience, made by the pastor elect prior to his consecration,[4] Dublin is again distinguished by the same designation. It had obviously no claim whatever to such a title; as it had never been the residence of the chief monarch of the country. It was little known before the commencement of the Danish wars,[5] and was still occupied by a petty Northman sovereign. But of late it had been gradually increasing in importance; and Lanfranc saw that, if recognised as the metropolis, he could thus advance a claim to be the ecclesiastical superior of all the Hibernian clergy. As if entrusted with the supervision of the Church of this country, he wrote a letter in A.D. 1074 to Gothric, King of

ninth century, when Johannes Scotus maintained the Zwinglian doctrine without incurring any ecclesiastical censure, that Berenger was now condemned as a heretic.

[1] According to Archdeacon Churton, "Lanfranc began the attempt . . . . of enforcing single life on the (English) clergy. . . . Lanfranc was also the first teacher in this country (*i.e.* England) who maintained the doctrine of Transubstantiation."—*Early English Church*, p. 284.

[2] Some contend that the Archbishop of Canterbury did not begin to consecrate the bishops of Dublin until after the Norman conquest. But of this there is no proof. The language of Lanfranc suggests a different conclusion. See p. 162, *note* (2).

[3] This letter is No. xxv. in Ussher's *Sylloge*. See his Works, iv. 488.

[4] This profession may be found in Ussher's *Sylloge*. See his Works, by Elrington, iv. 564. It is perhaps the earliest extant document of the kind connected with the Church of Ireland.

[5] Dr. Todd has remarked that, before the wars of the Northmen, Dublin was wholly unknown to the English historians. Introd. to *War of Gaedhil with Gaill*, p. lxxxi. *note*. It is to be observed that the immediate successors of this Patrick do *not* speak of Dublin as the metropolis. See Lanigan, iii. 482, and iv. 12. The Irish monarch had probably interfered and interdicted such language.

Dublin, in which he exhorts him to take steps to check certain improprieties by which the nation was dishonoured.[1] The only grievance which he specifies relates to the nuptial tie. The subjects of Gothric, as he alleges, not only contracted and dissolved marriage most capriciously, but also entered into matrimony within the degrees of kinship prohibited by canonical regulations. There was probably some reason for this complaint. In the days of their paganism the Northmen had been accustomed to much license; and as many of them were merely nominal converts to the Christian faith,[2] it was very difficult to induce them to observe the Scripture law of wedlock. But as the canon law of Rome often differs from the law of God,[3] it was not remarkable if the Irish frequently married in a way perfectly legitimate in the eye of heaven, and yet condemned by pontifical authority. In another letter, addressed during the same year, to Turlogh, King of Ireland,[4] Lanfranc adverts more minutely to the evils existing in the Irish Church. He complains, not only that matrimonial improprieties abounded, but also that holy orders were conferred by bishops for money, that bishops were set apart to office by a single bishop, and that infants were baptized without consecrated chrism. The charge of ordaining for money—though sufficiently grave—came with a bad grace from Lanfranc, as he himself a few years before, had thrown the shield of his defence over an English prelate who had obtained his bishopric by bribery;[5] and it was unworthy of this Archbishop

---

[1] This is Epist. xxvi. in Ussher's *Sylloge*. Works, iv. 490.

[2] King Olaf, or Olave, the Saint, propagated Christianity in Norway after a strange fashion. "In the Uplands he inquired particularly how it stood with their Christianity; if there were any there who would not renounce heathen ways, he drove some out of the country, mutilated others of hands or feet, or stung their eyes out: hung up some, cut down some with the sword: but let none go unpunished who would not serve God."—Introd. to *War of the Gaedhil with the Gaill*, cxcix. *note*.

[3] The canon law, for example, recognises the relations of god-fathers and god-mothers. See the restrictions as to marriage laid down by Gillebert, of Limerick, in his tract *De Statu Ecclesiæ*. Ussher's Works, iv. 504.

[4] This is Epist. xxvii. in Ussher's *Sylloge*. Ussher's Works, iv. 492. Turlogh was the grandson of Brian Boru. He was nominal King of Ireland from A.D. 1086 to A.D. 1094. See Todd's *St. Patrick*, 3, *note*.

[5] Remigius, bishop of Lincoln. See Collier's *Eccl. Hist. of Great Britain*, ii. 15.

of Canterbury to write to the King of Ireland condemning the neglect of the consecrated chrism in baptism. So erudite a scholar should have known that, in apostolic times, the initiatory ordinance of the Christian Church was administered without any such ointment. Towards the close of his letter, he recommends Turlogh to convene a meeting of the bishops and chief men of his kingdom, to take measures for ecclesiastical reform.

Lanfranc was succeeded in the English Primacy by his pupil, Anselm—perhaps the most profound theologian ever connected with the See of Canterbury. In his own age Anselm was venerated for his piety; and his treatise entitled, "Why is God man?"[1] remains, after the lapse of eight hundred years, a standard publication. But this great divine shared the prejudices of his times and of his teacher Lanfranc. Deeply pledged to the support of the See of Rome, he was desirous to promote the observance of its rites and ceremonies, as well as to extend its jurisdiction. Several of his letters to Irish churchmen and to King Murtogh, the son of Turlogh,[2] are still extant; and in these he repeats the complaints to be found in the correspondence of Lanfranc. The number of bishops in the island was specially offensive to him; as the humble position occupied by these men and their independent mode of action were not at all in harmony with the order and grandeur of the Roman Catholic hierarchy. "Bishops who ought to be to others the form and example of *canonical religion*, are," says Anselm, "consecrated irregularly, as we hear, either by single bishops, or in places where they should not be ordained."[3] "The episcopal honour suffers no little disparagement when he who is invested with the pontificate knows not, when ordained, where he is to go, or over what certain place he is to preside in his episcopal ministry."[4] Anselm earnestly exhorts King Murtogh to take steps for the redress of these irregularities.

Whilst the Pope and the Archbishop of Canterbury were

---

[1] "Cur Deus homo?"

[2] Murtogh was consequently the great-grandson of Brian Boru.

[3] Epistle xxxv. of Ussher's *Sylloge*. Ussher's Works, iv. 521.

[4] Epistle xxxvi. of Ussher's *Sylloge*. Ussher's Works, iv. 524.

endeavouring to obtain influence in the Irish Church, other parties, immediately connected with it, were meditating a change in its constitution. Its bishops had hitherto been numerous; in some towns, there were, at this time, several of these dignitaries;[1] and though, after three hundred years of desolation, the whole island in the beginning of the twelfth century had not, perhaps, more than 300,000 or 400,000 of population,[2] it is highly probable that it contained three hundred bishops.[3] The bishop's charge was not fixed by any defined boundaries—for he was at liberty to administer the ordinances of religion wherever he could find persons willing to receive them—and, when more than one member of the episcopal order officiated in a town, the most popular—without regard to the position of his church—was sure to have the largest congregation. But this state of things was quite at variance with arrangements which prevailed wherever the Pope had established his authority; as there, every parish priest had limits assigned to him beyond which he dare not act without permission; and every bishop was, not the pastor of a single flock, but the lord of a diocese. Some of the more aspiring of the Irish clergy now sought, by the help of royal influence, to bring their native church into conformity with this ecclesiastical model.

One of those who entered most zealously into this project was Malchus, bishop of Waterford. In early life he had been in England, where he had joined the Benedictines—an order

---

[1] "Quod in villis, vel civitatibus plures ordinantur." Lanfrancus ad Terdeluachum.—USSHER'S Works, iv. 322, *note*. See Harris's *Ware*, i. 308. Bernard says in his *Life of Malachy Morgair*:—"Singulae pene ecclesiae haberent episcopos." cap. x. Migne, *Patrol. Curs.*, tom. clxxxii. 1086.

[2] Sir William Petty estimates that the population amounted to only 300,000 at the time of the English invasion. *Political Anatomy of Ireland*, p. 317. Second edition. Antonio Foscarini, Venetian ambassador in England in 1618, estimated the population of Ireland at that time as 500,000. Motley's *Hist. of the United Netherlands*, iv. 139, *note*. London, 1867.

[3] Dr. Reeves states that "the *Annals of the Four Masters* furnish the *names* of *above one hundred churches* which at one time or other were governed by bishops."—*Eccl. Antiq. of Down, Connor and Dromore*, p. 126, *note*. From other sources the names may be multiplied. Dr. Mant admits that there were 300 bishops in Ireland at one time. *History of Church of Ireland*, i. p. 3.

of monks noted for their devotion to the See of Rome—and he had resided for some time in a monastery at Winchester. Returning to Ireland filled with high ideas of the excellency of papal arrangements, he contrived so to recommend himself to the clergy and people of Waterford that, with the concurrence of King Murtogh, they chose him for their bishop; and in A.D. 1096 he was consecrated at Canterbury by Anselm. The episcopal jurisdiction of Malchus did not extend beyond the town;[1] so that his personal interests were in harmony with his new ideas; as a change in the church polity was sure to add to his rank, his influence, and his emoluments. He was ardently supported by Samuel O'Haingly—who had also been a Benedictine monk in England, and who was, of course, imbued with the prejudices of that fraternity. "In A.D. 1095," says an old writer, "there came to Anselm a certain monk of the monastery of St. Alban's, an Irishman named Samuel. . . . . He was elected by Murierdach (Murtogh O'Brien) and the clergy and people to the bishopric of Dublin; and, by common suffrage, was recommended, according to ancient custom, to Anselm for consecration. Anselm, assenting to their election and petition, having kept this man with himself for some time in an honourable manner, *and diligently instructed him how he should conduct himself in the house of God*, received from him his profession of canonical obedience according to the old custom, and promoted him to the episcopal office."[2] O'Haingly, who was of an aspiring disposition, created no small excitement after his appointment, by causing his cross to be carried before him when he walked abroad. This was a display of episcopal pomp hitherto unknown in Ireland; and, as it implied a claim to ecclesiastical precedence on the part of the occupant of the see of Dublin, it seems to have given deadly offence to the bishops around him. On this occasion the English Primate deemed it prudent to interfere, and to rebuke the pride of the recently-consecrated prelate —telling him that such an assumption of state belonged only to an archbishop who had received the pall from the Roman

[1] See Ussher's Works, iv. 326.

[2] *Eadmer Hist. Nov.* lib. ii., at an. 1095. See Harris's *Ware*, i. 310.

Pontiff.[1] But the idea that Dublin was the metropolis of Ireland had been already mooted; and, though it was discountenanced by the king, it was still cherished in other quarters. The jurisdiction of its bishop did not yet extend beyond the walls of the place[2]—still a comparatively small town—and O'Haingly hoped to gain largely in the event of any new distribution of ecclesiastical power.

Another individual who took a very active part in promoting the scheme for the reconstruction of the Church of Ireland, was Gillebert, said to have been previously connected with Bangor. He had lived at one time in Normandy, where he had become acquainted with Anselm; and about A.D. 1105 he was chosen bishop of Limerick.[3] To prepare the way for the ecclesiastical revolution, he circulated an address to the clergy of the kingdom,[4] in which he pleads for a change in the ritual and polity of the Church. "At the request, and also at the command of many of you," says Gillebert, "I have attempted, not presumptuously, but desirous to obey your most pious order, to describe the canonical custom in the saying of hours, and in performing the duties of the whole Church ritual; so that the diverse and *schismatical rituals, with which almost all Ireland is deluded,* may give way to one Catholic and Roman office. For what can be said to be more indecent or schismatical than that the most learned in one ritual should be as an unskilful person and a laic in another's church? . . . . The apostle says, 'Ye may with one mind and one mouth glorify God.'[5] As therefore the dispersion of tongues caused by pride was brought back to unity by apostolic humility—so the confusion of rituals which has arisen from negligence and presumption, is to be reduced by your exertion and humility to the conse-

---

[1] See Epistle xxxix. in Ussher's *Sylloge.* Works, iv. 530.

[2] See Ussher's Works, iv. 326.

[3] See Lanigan, iv. 24.

[4] It is No. xxx. in Ussher's *Sylloge.* Works, iv. 500. It is addressed "Episcopis Presbyteris totius Hiberniae," and was probably written about A.D. 1107. About this time the Western Isle began to be called *Ireland;* and the name Scotia or Scotland was given to North Britain. See Ussher's *Primordia,* cap. xvi. p. 734. Dublin, 1639.

[5] Rom. xv. 6.

crated rule of the Roman Church. . . . . For it is plain that all the members of the Church are subject to one bishop, that is Christ, and to his Vicar, the blessed apostle Peter, and to his apostolic representative presiding in his See, and should be governed by them."[1]

It is clear that, when this address was written, the Romish liturgy was but little known in Ireland. It was probably used in Dublin, Waterford, Limerick, and a few other maritime towns where the Northmen were numerous;[2] but all these were places of importance, as they were the great marts of commerce; and they exercised more or less influence over a large portion of the country. It is obvious, too, from the subsequent part of this tract, that Irish churchmen were yet very imperfectly acquainted with the structure of the Romish hierarchy; as Gillebert goes on to describe the various orders of clergy, including door-keepers, readers, exorcists, acolyths, sub-deacons, deacons, and priests. He compares the Church to a pyramid—the lower part consisting of the worldly, and those who live in wedlock—and the higher part of the monks and clergy, culminating in the Pope. According to Gillebert, it is the duty of the bishop to ordain the abbot, the abbess and the priest, and other ecclesiastics.[3] It is the duty of the Primate to preside over the bishops, and to ordain the king. The archbishop cannot act without the authority of the Pope—from whom he is to receive the pall or pallium. These things must have sounded strangely in the ears of Irish churchmen, as they had hitherto been accustomed to very different arrangements; and had not the bishop of Limerick been assured of royal support, he would not have ventured to propound them.

---

[1] Ussher obviously mistakes the date of this document, as well as of several others in his *Sylloge*. Gillebert was Papal Legate in Ireland at the time of the Synod of Rathbreasail in A.D. 1110, and this tract was intended to prepare for that meeting. See Lanigan, iv. 26.

[2] Such as Wexford and Carlingford.

[3] It appears from this tract of Gillebert that extreme unction was at this time administered in the Romish Church in cases where the sick man was expected to recover. "Ungere potest quemlibet fidelem semel in quolibet gravi dolere: quia unctio sancta non solum animae, sed et corporis saepe medelam tribuit."—Ussher's Works, iv. 506.

It so happened, however, that the monarch Murtogh O'Brien, who figures so conspicuously at this period,[1] was quite prepared for a change in the ecclesiastical constitution. He was under weighty obligations to the Archbishop of Canterbury; and the letters he had received from that great dignitary had not been addressed to him in vain. Arnulf, Earl of Pembroke —who was married to his daughter—had been outlawed by Henry I. of England for rebellion. Anselm, at his urgent entreaty, had interceded with the king; and had succeeded in obtaining his son-in-law's pardon. We find the Irish prince, in a letter to the English primate, most respectfully thanking him for his services, and assuring him that he was ready to carry out the instructions conveyed in his correspondence.[2] The English monarch had also effectually secured the attachment of this Hibernian prince. "So devoted," says William of Malmesbury, "were Murtogh and his successors to Henry I., that they wrote nothing but what flattered him, nor did anything but what he directed."[3] Other considerations inclined the Irish monarch to contemplate with favour a change in ecclesiastical arrangements. Though in his correspondence with Anselm he is addressed as "King of Hibernia," he ruled, in reality, only over Leath Mogha, or the southern half of Ireland. Leath Cuinn, or the northern half, was governed by Donald McLaughlin, a prince of the royal race of O'Neill. Between Murtogh O'Brien and Donald McLaughlin there were almost perpetual wars; and the co-arb of Patrick had more than once to interfere, and endeavour to moderate their bloody struggles.[4] Before the death of Malachy II. in A.D. 1022—when the whole island was under one chief monarch—the claim of the abbot of Armagh to levy tribute in Munster was rather encouraged by the sovereign; but now—that two independent and hostile kings reigned in the north and in the south—the case was altogether different. Prescription had, indeed, sanctioned the

[1] He reigned upwards of twenty years, and died A.D. 1119. *Rer. Hib. Script. Veteres.*, tom. i., p. lxxxv. According to Lanigan, he was dethroned in A.D. 1116. He then took holy orders, and died three years afterwards. *Eccl. Hist.* iii. p. 485.

[2] See Epistle xxxvii. in Ussher's *Sylloge.* Works, iv. 526.

[3] See Ledwich's *Antiq. of Ireland*, p. 128. Dublin, 1803.

[4] See *Annals of the Four Masters*, at A.D. 1097, A.D. 1099, and A.D. 1113.

demand of the northern co-arb; and the veneration of Murtogh for Patrick, the patron saint of Ireland, perhaps rendered him unwilling to oppose it; yet he could not but feel that he was placed in a somewhat disadvantageous position, so long as an ecclesiastic, residing in the kingdom of his rival, was at liberty to traverse his territory, to exact contributions throughout its borders, to visit its churches, and to challenge the supervision of its clergy. He therefore resolved to remove the anomaly by setting up another representative of Patrick in Leath Mogha. We read, accordingly, that in A.D. 1101, he "made a grant such as no king had ever made before,"[1] for "he presented Cashel to the church in honour of God and Patrick."[2] Cashel was now the capital of the kingdom of Munster; and—that its bishop might be able to support his dignity in a style somewhat corresponding to that of the abbot of Armagh—Murtogh bestowed on him the lordship of the city with all its rents and profits. It was given "without any claim of layman or clergyman upon it;"[3] so that it was not to pay tribute either to the king himself or to the co-arb of Patrick. It is probable that Murtogh performed this act of munificence under the advice of Anselm; and it is obvious, from the sequel, that he thus contemplated the establishment of an archbishopric in Munster.

The only Irish churchman peculiarly affected by this arrangement, and likely to give it opposition, was the co-arb of Patrick. Even he could do little to prevent it, when it was patronized by the powerful King of Leath Mogha. He might remonstrate and threaten; but, though supported by all the forces of Leath Cuinn, he might find it unsafe to enter Munster, and attempt to exact tribute in defiance of such an adversary as Murtogh O'Brien. At this time the co-arb of Patrick was a person of a different stamp from many of his predecessors; for Celsus, or Kellach, who in A.D. 1105—when only twenty-six years of age—had attained the abbatial office, was an ecclesiastic and a man of education. The appearance of

[1] O'Donovan's *Four Masters*, at A.D. 1101.

[2] *Keating*, as quoted in King's *Memoir*, p. 82.

[3] *Annals of the Four Masters*, at A.D. 1101.

the Book of Armagh had much the same effect as the appearance of the false decretals attributed to the Popes—it cherished pride by apparently supplying an indefeasible title to an unscriptural dignity; and the co-arbs of Patrick had been increasing in degeneracy during the three hundred years which immediately followed its compilation. The co-arbship was claimed by a particular family as its exclusive inheritance;[1] the possession of the Book of Armagh and of the Staff of Jesus was supposed to confer a right to the office; many of the abbots were mere laymen who performed their ecclesiastical duties by deputy; and, when the place became vacant, the disputes as to the succession often led to battery and bloodshed. "A most pernicious custom had been established by the diabolical ambition of some men in power," says a writer of this century, "that a holy See was held by hereditary succession. Nor did they permit any to obtain the episcopate save those who were of their own tribe and family. Nor had this execrable succession made small progress—for already fifteen generations, if they may be so called—had passed over in this wickedness. And so far had this wicked and adulterous generation confirmed to themselves this unholy privilege—or, I should rather call it, this iniquity deserving of the most condign punishment—that, though as it sometimes happened, clergymen of their family failed, bishops of it never failed. In fine, eight married men, and without ordination, though men of learning, preceded Celsus. From whence proceeded all that dissolution of ecclesiastical discipline throughout the whole of Ireland, ... that inefficiency of censures, and that decay of religion."[2]

At this period the visitations of the abbot of Armagh seem to have completely lost their spiritual character. Instead of undertaking to discountenance ungodliness, or disseminate a knowledge of the Gospel, this high functionary appears to

---

[1] This claim was sanctioned by the Brehon law. We there read:—"The tribe of the patron saint shall succeed to the Church as long as there shall be a person fit to be an abbot of the said tribe of the patron saint; even though there should be but a psalm-singer of them, it is he that will obtain the abbacy."—*Senchus Mor.*, vol. iii. 73. Dublin, 1873.

[2] Bernard's *Life of Malachy*, chap. x. Migne, *Patr. Cursus*, tom. clxxxii. 1086.

have been chiefly interested in the collection of his dues. When returning from one of his official tours he had a far greater resemblance to a freebooter on his way home from a very successful raid, than to a representative of the Apostles, who had been confirming the churches. It is a proof of the spiritual blindness of the times that the Irish annalists describe with admiration the multitudes of cattle which the co-arb of Patrick drove along with him as he moved back to Armagh. They tell, for example, how the abbot Maelisa, in A.D. 1068, made a visitation of Munster, and "obtained a full visitation tribute both in screaballs[1] and offerings."[2] The quality of the offerings is stated more specifically in the account given of the first progress of Celsus after he entered on the business of his office. We are informed that in Ulster he obtained in A.D. 1106 "a cow from every six persons, and a heifer in calf from every three persons, besides many other offerings;" and that in Munster he obtained "seven cows and seven sheep, and half an ounce of silver from every cantred,[3] besides many jewels."[4] No wonder that King Murtogh hailed even the distant prospect of deliverance from the payment of such a tribute to an ecclesiastic, living in another kingdom!

Celsus no doubt felt that he could not vindicate the abuses connected with the administration of the abbatial office; and his own good sense taught him that it would be vain to attempt to resist the changes contemplated by Murtogh and the more influential of his clergy. He therefore resolved to make a virtue of necessity, and to concur in these arrangements. He seems to have been propitiated by being permitted to continue in the enjoyment of his vested rights,[5] and

[1] A screaball was a silver coin weighing twenty-four grains. We are to remember that silver was then vastly more valuable than at present.

[2] *Annals of the Four Masters*, at A.D. 1068.

[3] "Munster contains seventy cantreds. . . . A cantred contains thirty town lands. Every town land can pasture 300 cows."—HARRIS's *Ware*, ii. 30.

[4] *Annals of the Four Masters*, at A.D. 1106.

[5] Hence we find him making a visitation of Munster in A.D. 1120, and obtaining "his full demand."—*Annals of the Four Masters* at this year. Malachy Morgair long afterwards visited Munster, when that part of the island was under the government of princes favourable to him. See *Annals*, at A.D. 1134, and A.D. 1138.

by being himself at once advanced to the dignity of an archbishop.[1] He accordingly assented to the convocation of a great convention which met at Rathbreasail in A.D. 1110,[2] and which inaugurated a complete revolution in the polity of the Church of Ireland.

This synod of Rathbreasail has been often called the Synod of Fiadh-mac-Aengussa.[3] Both these names have long since disappeared; and it is now somewhat difficult to determine the situation of the place which they indicate.[4] It is not improbable that the meeting was held in the monastery of Clonenagh, in Queen's County.[5] In ancient times the laity, as well as the clergy, took part in the proceedings of Irish synods; and they did not want representatives at this famous convention. The Pope must meanwhile have been apprized of what was going forward, as he had nominated the most zealous Irish advocate of Romanism—Gillebert, bishop of Limerick—to act as his commissioner in this country. Gillebert, who was the *first*[6] apostolic legate ever appointed in Ireland, presided, as the representative of the sovereign Pontiff, in the Synod of Rathbreasail. With the exception of Celsus of Armagh, who

---

[1] Hence it is stated, in an old translation of the *Annals of Ulster*, that on the occasion of his first visitation of Munster, in A.D. 1106, he *became archbishop by taking orders at the request of Ireland in general.*" See King's *Memoir*, p. 80.

[2] Lanigan dates this Synod in A.D. 1118, but the date here given is that adopted by Keating, Lynch (in his *Cambrensis Eversus*), and King.

[3] These two names indicate the same place according to the *Annals of Innisfallen*, as edited by Dr. O'Conor in his *Rer. Hiber. Scrip. Veteres*. See also King's *Memoir*, pp. 81, 83; and *Cambrensis Eversus*, by Kelly, ii. 53.

[4] According to some they point to Mountrath in Queen's Co.—the post-town of the parish of Clonenagh. According to others, Rathbreasail is in Co. Tipperary. See *Journal of the Royal* (Kilkenny) *Hist. and Arch. Association of Ireland*, for July 1874, p. 188, *note* (3).

[5] The *Annals of Clonenagh*, compiled in the monastery of the same name, contained an account of the proceedings of the Synod from which Keating derived the information respecting it to be found in his history. The *Book of Clonenagh* is, it is said, now lost. The *Annals of Ulster* and the *Annals of the Four Masters* give a very unsatisfactory report of the transactions of this important meeting. The Northern clergy appear to have known little of it. It is a remarkable fact that neither the *Annals of Ulster* nor the *Annals of the Four Masters* takes any notice of Gillebert of Limerick, though he acted so prominent a part on this and other occasions about this period.

[6] This fact is distinctly stated by Bernard in his *Life of Malachy*, chap. x.

had a deep personal interest in the projected changes, no ecclesiastic seems to have attended from Leath Cuinn,[1] or the northern half of Ireland. There were present fifty-eight bishops,[2] 317 priests, and vast numbers of the monastic orders. King Murtogh O'Brien himself sat in the assembly surrounded by his nobles.[3] The Archbishop of Cashel, or as he is called in some old documents, *the Archbishop of Munster*,[4] was also in attendance.

Various evidences suggest that the propositions to be submitted to the meeting were not regarded with favour by many of the clergy. Men who celebrated the worship of the Church in a way to which they had been accustomed from their infancy, could scarcely be expected to relish an overture for the adoption of the Romish ritual. Neither was it to be anticipated that the old parochial bishops,[5] who had so long

---

[1] We may thus account partially for the very vague notice of the Synod of Fiadh-mac-Aengussa to be found in the *Annals of the Four Masters*.

[2] This is the number of bishops given in the *Annals of Innisfallen*. See Lanigan, iv. 38. See also Dr. O'Conor's *Hist. Address*, part. ii. 75, 76, where he quotes from the *Ulster Annals*, and where it is stated that there were present "fifty bishops *or a few more*." These same words occur in the *Annals of Loch Cé*, vol. i. p. 101. London, 1871.

[3] See Lanigan, iv. 37. Murtogh is described as attended by the chiefs "of the *southern part* of Ireland." See Wilkins's *Concilia*, i. 392, where this Synod is said to have been held in A.D. 1112.

[4] Lanigan, supposing that Maelmuire O'Dunan, his predecessor, died in A.D. 1117, dates the Synod of Rathbreasail in A.D. 1118, on the ground that Maelisa O'Hainmaire was now archbishop of Cashel; but King and Kelly have shown that there is not much weight in this objection. See King's *Memoir*, p. 84; and *Cambrensis Eversus* by Kelly, ii. 792, *note*. King has adduced very good reasons to prove that Maelisa O'Hainmaire was no other than Malchus of Waterford. See his *Memoir of the Primacy of Armagh*, pp. 90, 91. O'Mahony says:—"Mael-Isa O'h-Anmiri died at Lismore of St. Mochuda, in the 88th year of his age, in the year 1135. He is styled bishop of Port Largi (Waterford), and chief senior of Ireland in the *Irish Annals*."—O'MAHONY'S *Keating*, p. 601, *note*.

[5] There were formerly in Ireland 184 *tuaths* or territories, and each seems to have been under the government of at least one petty *rig* or king. O'Curry's *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Irish*, by Sullivan, i. 79, 96, 100. Each tuath appears to have had at least one bishop; and in places where there were seven churches together, there were seven bishops. Every man who had a certain amount of land was required, when it came to his turn, "to sustain the visit of a king, or bishop, or poet, or judge from the road."—*Ibid.* ii. 35. It is obvious therefore that there must have been at one time hundreds of bishops in the country.

enjoyed the independence of presbyterian parity, would be ready to submit cheerfully to the dictation of a diocesan. Those who hoped to benefit by the change would, of course, be willing to give it their support; and others might be afraid to incur the royal displeasure by their opposition; but, notwithstanding the influence of the king, only a minority of the bishops put in an appearance. Those who were present did not probably form more than one third of the number who might have been found in Leath Mogha.[1] Many of these rural dignitaries lived in parts of the country under the government of dynasts over whom Murtogh had little control, and who had consequently nothing to apprehend from the neglect of his summons. The most decisive proof of the want of cordiality with which they looked on the proceedings, is supplied by the fact that the resolutions approved by the Synod were only very partially carried into execution.[2] At the end of upwards of forty years, many of the remnants of the old Church government still remained.[3]

It can be proved, by a reference to particular localities, that some tuaths had a plurality of bishops. According to a MS. in the British Museum, entitled *An abbreviate of the getting of Ireland and of the decays of the same*, there were 202 *tuaths* in the island before the time of the English invasion. O'Curry's *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Irish*, by Sullivan, i. xcix., *note*. Upwards of 200 years after the English invasion Ireland had still a large number of little independent potentates. Seventy-five of them at one time did homage to Richard II. See Leland's *History of Ireland*, i. 343.

[1] Ledwich says that "but *about a sixth part* of the episcopal order consented to the decrees of Rathbreasail." *Antiq.*, p. 128. It was now arranged that "there should not be more than *five* dioceses in all Connaught."—See *Camb. Eversus*, ii. p. 788. But formerly at least *nine* bishops were to be found in Co. Roscommon alone, viz: the bishops of Elphin, Ballytober, Assylin, Ardcarne, Kilbarry, Clontusket, Ogulla, Creeve, and Clooncraff. See an old Irish tract on the *Inauguration of Cathal Crobhdearg O'Conor*, who died A.D. 1224, said to have been written by one who was present at the ceremony. *Trans. of the Kilkenny and South-east of Ireland Archæological Society* for 1853, vol. ii., part ii., p. 341.

[2] Even Lanigan admits that the Synod "did not succeed to any considerable degree in reducing the number of sees."—*Ecc. Hist.* iv. 42. See also King's *Primer of the Hist. of the Holy Catholic Church in Ireland*, ii. 452. Dublin, 1846.

[3] Hence in A.D. 1152 the Synod of Kells found it necessary to re-enact many of the arrangements now made. It is stated, in a preceding note, that there were formerly from 184 to 202 separate territories in Ireland; but, judging from the number of clans, the petty kings or chiefs must have been much more numerous. In Tyrone there were, in the twelfth century, thirty-four clans; in Tyrconnel,

Anselm, as we have seen, had long previously entered into correspondence with King Murtogh O'Brien, and had urged him to undertake the reformation of the Church. The Archbishop addresses the monarch in the most complimentary terms when endeavouring to win him over to his views. "I thank God," says he, "for the many good things which I hear of your Highness. . . . I trust that He who has given you his grace to do the many good things you have done, will confer also the power of doing those things you know He wishes you to do, in addition to what you are doing. Wherefore, my glorious son, most dear to me in God, I pray that you will amend with all urgency and care those things in your kingdom which you know should be amended according to the Christian religion."[1] Murtogh was unable to read,[2] so that he was not very specially qualified for the work of an ecclesiastical Reformer; but the Romish party had completely gained his confidence; and he took the lead in dictating the arrangements of the Synod of Rathbreasail. It must have been under his direction that Gillebert ventured to preside; and, had it not been for the way in which his native Church was compromised in the Book of Armagh,[3] Celsus, the co-arb of

---

twenty; in Cavan and Leitrim, twenty-seven; in Fermanagh, twelve; in North Connaught, fifty; in South Connaught, fifty-four; in Dublin and Kildare, twenty-two; in King's County and Queen's County, thirty-three; in Cork and Kerry, thirty-four; in Waterford and Tipperary, forty-four. These together make 330 separate clans; and yet they include only a portion of the country. See Connellan's *Annals of Ireland*, pp. 50 *note*, 52 *note*, 79 *note*, 77-78 *note*, 100 note, 126-132 *note*, 314-316 *note*, 198-201 *note*. Dublin, 1846. If every clan had its bishop, there is nothing improbable in the statement that at one time there were 700 bishops in Ireland. A petty kingdom sometimes corresponded to a modern barony. O'Flaherty tells of a barony in the present county of Waterford "where chiefs of the same family reigned to the invasion of the English." *Ogygia*, by Hely, vol. i. 43. Dublin, 1793. Nathy, who is said to have opposed Palladius, was prince of Hy-garchon, part of the present county of Wicklow. See *Ogygia Vindicated*, by O'Conor, p. 218. Dublin, 1775.

[1] Epistles xxxv. and xxxvi. in Ussher's *Sylloge*. Works, iv. 520, 523.

[2] Anselm hints at this in one of his letters. "Si igitur Excellentia Vestra divinarum Scripturarum sententias, quae huic infami negotio obviant, per se legere non valet; praecipite episcopis et religiosis clericis, qui in vestro regno sunt, ut eas vobis edicant." Epistle xxxvi., Ussher's *Sylloge*. Works, iv. 523.

[3] The right of appeal from the decision of the co-arb of Patrick to the Pope is there recognised; and on this ground the Pope's legate might now claim precedence.

Patrick, might have claimed that honour. Gillebert represented a bishopric only very recently established; but he was perhaps more competent than any other individual present to expound the law of Rome; and it was therefore most desirable that he should occupy an influential position. As the Pope's legate he claimed the right to occupy the chair; and the admission of the claim on the part of the assembly virtually involved a recognition of the papal supremacy. On the day when he was permitted to preside at Rathbreasail, the Church of Ireland, for the first time, formally bowed her neck to the yoke of Rome.

We have no full and exact record of what occurred at this Synod, so that we can give only an imperfect account of its proceedings. But we may presume that the President—who had already complained so bitterly of the "diverse and schismatical liturgies with which almost all Ireland was deluded,"—did his utmost to establish conformity to "one Catholic and Roman office." We have more definite information as to the changes which were made in the polity of the Church.[1] All Ireland was placed under the government of twenty-three diocesan bishops, and two archbishops. Leath Cuinn, or the Northern half, was to have twelve diocesan bishops under the supervision of the Archbishop of Armagh. Leath Mogha, or the Southern half, was to have eleven diocesan bishops,[2] under the supervision of the Archbishop of Cashel. The bishop of Dublin was not included in this arrangement, as he was still permitted to remain under the care of the Archbishop of Canterbury. The aspiring O'Haingly was perhaps dissatisfied that he was not advanced to the rank of a metropolitan; and therefore preferred to continue as he was, rather than submit to the new dignitary set up in the Southern province. The twelve bishoprics in Leath Cuinn, under the primate of Armagh, were those of

---

[1] Keating, in his history, appears to have given extracts from the minutes of the Synod, as contained in the *Book of Clonenagh*. See *Cambrensis Eversus*, by Lynch, ii. 784, 792.

[2] The Synod originally intended to have twelve diocesan bishops in Leath Mogha; but, in consequence of the opposition of O'Haingly of Dublin, this arrangement was not adopted.

Clogher, Ardstraw, Derry, Connor, Down, Duleek, Clonard, Tuam, Clonfert, Cong, Killala, and Ardcarn:[1] the eleven bishoprics in Leath Mogha, under the Archbishop of Cashel, were those of Lismore or Waterford, Cork, Rathmaighe, Deisgert or Ardfert, Limerick, Killaloe, Emly, Kilkenny, Leighlin, Kildare, Glendaloch, and Ferns or Wexford. The boundaries of these dioceses were also exactly marked out; and though, in consequence of change of names and other circumstances, we may now be unable in all cases to trace them, there can be no doubt but that they were all well understood in the early part of the twelfth century.[2] The legislators closed their proceedings with the following extraordinary prayer: "The blessing of God Almighty, and of St. Peter and St. Paul, and of the representative of St. Peter's successor—the legate Gillebert, bishop of Limerick—and of Celsus, St. Patrick's successor, Primate of Ireland, and of Maelisa O'Hainmaire, archbishop of Cashel, and of all the bishops, gentry, and clergy in this holy Synod of Rathbreasail, light and remain upon every one who shall approve, ratify, and observe these ordinances; and, on the other side, their curses on the infringers of them."[3]

Shortly after this synod and in the same year, another great ecclesiastical convention was held at Usneagh in Meath.[4]

[1] It has been remarked that all Connaught was included in Leath Cuinn at this period. See *Girat. Camb.*, by Kelly, ii. 783, *note*.

[2] These boundaries may be all found specified in an extract from Lynch's Latin translation of *Keating's History of Ireland* appended to the second vol. of *Cambrensis Eversus*, 783-792. Celtic Society's publications. Dublin, 1850. See also Carew's *Eccl. Hist. of Ireland*, pp. 401-2.

[3] Lanigan, iv. 43.

[4] The Synod of Usneagh has been often confounded with that of Rathbreasail, but they were unquestionably different. Usneagh, at which the King of Meath attended, was in the kingdom of Meath; Rathbreasail, at which the King of Leath Mogha was present, was in Leath Mogha. "The hill of Uisneach," says Dr. Petrie in a letter to Sir Thomas Larcom, "is one of the most celebrated places in Irish history. It was considered the centre of the kingdom, and the huge stone (there) . . . . was the boundary stone of the four provinces, before Meath was formed by taking a part from each. I remember it well, and it is, perhaps, *the most gigantic boundary stone in the world.* It was here the great meetings of the states were held, and the Druidic festivals of Bealten or the Sun were celebrated." —*Life of Petrie*, by Stokes, p. 262.

Its object appears to have been, partly to modify, and partly to carry out, the arrangements made at Rathbreasail. Morogh O'Maolseachlain, King of Meath, was present, and took part in the proceedings. By the Synod of Rathbreasail the kingdom of Meath[1] had been divided into two dioceses—Duleek and Clonard. The abbot of Clonmacnois, or, as he was called, the co-arb of Kiaran,—who figures so conspicuously in the ecclesiastical history of Ireland—had been strangely overlooked;[2] as the place with which he was connected is not named among the bishoprics established at Rathbreasail. The Synod of Usneagh assigned to it the position which had been given to Duleek;[3] and, by the authority of this convention, "the parishes of Meath were equally divided between the bishops of Clonmacnois and Clonard."[4] There appears to have been till this date a bishop in every congregation; but now provision was made for the gradual extinction of these dignitaries; and, in the meantime, they were placed under the care of diocesans.

Many modern writers, unable to reconcile their views of ecclesiastical polity with the arrangements of the ancient Church of Ireland, have represented the class of bishops now

---

[1] The kingdom of Meath contained what are now the counties of East and West Meath, Longford, part of King's County, and some other territories. Harris's *Ware*, ii. 31.

[2] Some offence taken by King Murtogh seems to have been the cause of this marked omission. At this very time we are told, in the *Annals of the Four Masters*, that "Clonmacnois was plundered by the Dalg-Cais *at the instance of Murtogh O'Brien*." See also *Chronicum Scotorum*, p. 313.

[3] The *Chronicum Scotorum*, supposed to have been compiled by an abbot of Clonmacnois, who lived at this very time, bears more distinct testimony on this point than almost any other ancient authority. This chronicle also states that the Synod of Usneagh was held *after* the Synod of Rathbreasail or Fiadh-mac-Aengussa, but *in the same year*. See *Chronicum Scotorum*. Introd. 39 and at A.D. 1107, p. 315. London, 1866.

[4] This is the statement of the *Annals of Innisfallen*, as quoted by Lanigan, iv. 39. There appear to have been at one time at least twenty-two bishoprics in the present diocese of Meath, viz:—Clonard, Duleek, Kells, Trim, Ardbraccan, Dunshaughlin, Slane, Fore, Killare, Lynally, Trevet, Rahugh, Kildalkey, Kilbrew, Lann-Leire, Kilskyre, Castle Kieran, Fennor, Dulane, Indenen, Magh-Breagh, and Stackallen. See Cogan's *Diocese of Meath*, i. 5-7. Dublin, 1862. Cogan, without any authority, asserts that many of the bishops were chorepiscopi. See also Reeves's *Eccl. Antiq.*, p. 128.

doomed to extinction as *chorepiscopi*,[1] or dignitaries not properly of the episcopal order. But they thus decide without the slightest warrant. There is not in the old annals of our country any statement to sanction this theory.[2] No document can be produced, written before the Synod of Rathbreasail, in which any Irish bishop is ever called a Chorepiscopus. Some may have expatiated over a larger territory than others—as parishes even yet are not of the same extent—and some may have enjoyed a larger revenue than those around them; but all are described as of the same rank, and as performing the same official duties. In a country thinly populated—where a portion of the inhabitants lived at a great distance from a church—a few of the bishops may have spent much time in itinerating, and in supplying the services of religion to those who could not have otherwise enjoyed them; but we have reason to believe that by far the majority of these dignitaries had ecclesiastical buildings in which each statedly ministered to a regular congregation. The old Irish bishops were, generally speaking, pastors of single flocks; and the Synod of Rathbreasail marks the commencement of the transition from congregational to diocesan episcopacy.

During the eleventh century the Church of Ireland experienced a sad deterioration. The destruction of so many of her seminaries of learning by the Northmen had extinguished much of the light of scriptural Christianity; and her growing intercourse with Rome had promoted the advancement of superstition and will-worship. Malachy II., who died in A.D. 1022, submitted to receive extreme unction;[3] and, after his time, the rite was more and more observed. We yet hear little of the worship of images; but the invocation of saints

[1] Ireland in the twelfth century continued in much the same position as was North Africa in the fourth. See my *Old Catholic Church*, p. 128.

[2] Mr. King has very properly remarked:—"I see no proof whatsoever that the old Irish observed any distinction between ordinaries and chorepiscopi. . . . If such an order had existed I suppose Lanfranc and Anselm would have been as likely to have been aware of the circumstance, and to have made all due allowance for it, as Dr. Lanigan, or any of the moderns."—*Supplementary Volume to Primer of the Church History of Ireland*, p. 1013. Dublin, 1851.

[3] See O'Donovan's *Annals of the Four Masters*, at A.D. 1022.

had long been practised, and prayers for the dead were encouraged. We read that, after the death of King Malachy, the clergy "sung masses, hymns, psalms, and canticles for the welfare of his soul."[1] Penance often took the place of repentance; and the form of godliness was substituted for faith in Christ. In A.D. 1096 a terrible pestilence swept over Ireland. Since the days of the yellow plague, four or five hundred years before, the country had not been visited by so dreadful a desolator. Multitudes perished; all were filled with consternation; and many believed that the end of the world was at hand. How did the clergy act under these appalling circumstances? They did not acknowledge—if we may judge from the accounts handed down to us—that they themselves had provoked God by neglecting the guidance of His Word, and by "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." They did not proclaim that Christ is the only Mediator, and that there is more sympathy for sinners in His bosom than there is in all the saints and angels of heaven united. They did not call on the chieftains to give up their endless contentions, and to live at peace. We do not read that the people were exhorted to set their hearts in order and to prepare to meet their God. We are not told that the ten commandments were expounded to them, that they were reminded of the awful consequences of departing from the law and the testimony, that they were entreated to search and try their ways, that they were admonished to believe with the heart unto righteousness, and besought "to bring forth fruits meet for repentance." The remedy adopted was such as was never prescribed by prophets or apostles. "The clergy of Ireland thought good to cause all the inhabitants of the kingdom to fast from Wednesday to Sunday, once every month, for the space of one whole year, except solemn and great festival days: they also appointed certain prayers to be said daily. The king, noblemen, and all the subjects of the kingdom were very beneficent towards the Church and poor men this year—*whereby God's wrath was assuaged.* The king[2] of his great bounty gave great im-

[1] *Ibid.*

[2] Evidently Murtogh O'Brien,

munities and freedom to churches that were theretofore charged with cess and other extraordinary country charges, with many other large and bountiful gifts."[1] "Many lands were granted to clergymen by kings and chieftains."[2]

At this time the ordinance of fasting was sometimes sadly perverted. It was observed—not to cherish a spirit of repentance in those by whom it was practised—but to bring down judgments on others. Any evil which subsequently happened to obnoxious individuals was imputed to its influence. We are told, for example, how in A.D. 1043, there was a "*fasting of the clergy*" in Westmeath, "*against*" a certain chieftain at whom they had taken umbrage; and it is significantly added—"In the place where he turned his back on the clergy, in that very place he was beheaded before the end of a month."[3]

By the Synod of Rathbreasail, the liberties of the Irish Church were seriously compromised. The pastors throughout the island could no longer look on each other as brethren, and act with the independence of Christian freemen. They were subjected to a diocesan authority which they soon felt to be alike dictatorial and oppressive. What was worse—they were placed under the dominion of the Pope, who quickly taught them to know the bitterness of an iron despotism.

---

[1] *Annals of Clonmacnois*, at A.D. 1095 (properly 1096).

[2] *Annals of the Four Masters*, at A.D. 1096. The Brehons, or old Irish judges, believed that "tithes, first fruits, and alms prevented the occurrence of plague." *Senchus Mor.*, vol. iii. pp. 13, 15. Dublin, 1873. Tithes were legally established in the century after the date of the occurrence mentioned in the text; but proceedings such as those here described prepared the way for their exaction.

[3] *Annals of the Four Masters*, at A.D. 1043. As to this system of *fasting against* obnoxious persons, see Reeves's *Adamnan*. Appendix to preface, liv. *note*. Sometimes two parties tested their maledictory powers by fasting against each other. *Ibid.*

BOOK II.

FROM THE SYNOD OF RATHBREASAIL TO THE DEATH OF HENRY VII.

A.D. 1110 TO A.D. 1509.

CHAPTER I.

FROM THE CLOSE OF THE SYNOD OF RATHBREASAIL TO THE CLOSE OF THE SYNOD OF CASHEL, A.D. 1110 TO A.D. 1172.

If the arrangements adopted by the Synod of Rathbreasail were intended to promote the moral improvement of the country, they proved completely inefficient. In the generation which followed, Ireland presented a scene of confusion and crime such as it had, perhaps, never before exhibited since the days of its great apostle.[1] It is not difficult to account for this result. Other causes may have contributed to aggravate the evils arising from the introduction of ecclesiastical novelties; but the measures now employed to change the religious usages of the people had apparently a demoralizing influence. By the high-handed interference of King Murtogh and a few aspiring churchmen, the majority of the pastors had been degraded, and the national worship set aside. The interference with vested rights involved in the carrying out of the canons of Rathbreasail awakened the fiercest opposition.[2] Many of the old families of the country

[1] In the *Annals of the Four Masters*, at A.D. 1145, the following strange entry appears:—"Great war in this year, so that Ireland was *a trembling sod.*"

[2] Keating, according to O'Connor's translation, gives the following account of the proceedings at Rathbreasail:—"In this convention *the revenue of the clergy and the church lands* were confirmed *to the several bishops of the island* for their maintenance *and support of the episcopal character*, which lands were to be exempted from tribute and chief rents, and other public contributions, and so remain in that state of freedom and independency for ever." O'Mahony's translation is here not quite so intelligible. It is:—"It was upon this occasion that

had, as they conceived, a hereditary interest in the property belonging to the monasteries; and, when their claims were ignored by the regulations now established, they prepared to resist, by force, what they considered spoliation. The organization of the system of diocesan episcopacy, with an adequate provision for the new lords spiritual, was accomplished by the power of the sword, and produced frightful scenes of commotion. Civil war raged throughout the land;[1] the ties of nature were disregarded; and the most horrid crimes were perpetrated.[2] It is significant that, among the acts of violence recorded, we read frequently of the pillage or destruction of churches and monasteries.[3] The depredators were professing Christians, who complained that they were aggrieved, and who employed this mode of protesting against ecclesiastical injustice. The reckless violation of oaths forms another melancholy feature in the history of this period.[4] Religion must have lost its hold on the conscience when such crimes were committed.

One of the most remarkable men with whom we meet in the ecclesiastical history of Ireland, presents himself, at this time, to our notice. His name is Malachy O'Morgair.[5] His life has been written by a personage even more distinguished than himself—the famous Bernard, abbot of Clairvaux in France, an author who has often been designated "The last of

the churches of Ireland were given up, in full possession, *to the Irish prelates*, who were thenceforth to hold them for ever free from the *authority* or *rent* of any temporal lord."—O'Mahony's *Keating*, p. 597. No wonder that this sudden transference of such a large amount of landed property created civil war.

[1] Thus we read in the *Annals of the Four Masters*, at A.D. 1126:—"*A great storm of war throughout Ireland in general*, so that Celsus, successor of Patrick, was obliged to be for one month and a year absent from Armagh, establishing peace among the men of Ireland, and promulgating rules and good customs in every district *among the laity and the clergy*."

[2] See O'Donovan's *Annals of the Four Masters*, ii. 1051, *note* f.; and *Leland*, i. 12.

[3] See *Annals of the Four Masters*, at A.D. 1129, 1135, 1149, 1154, 1156, 1158, and 1163. See also Lanigan, iv. 55.

[4] See this illustrated in the *Annals of the Four Masters*, at A.D. 1139, 1143, and 1159. In the last case the annalist exclaims:—"Woe to the country in which this deed was perpetrated."

[5] In the *Irish Annals* he is called Maelmaedhog O'Morgair.

the Fathers." Bernard had never been in Ireland; but he was well acquainted with the subject of his memoir; for Malachy had been repeatedly at Clairvaux; and, on the occasion of his last visit to the monastery, had expired in the presence of his biographer. Malachy and Bernard were kindred spirits; both were noted for their ardent temperament; both were men of sincere piety; and both had wonderful influence over all around them. Bernard obtained some of the materials of his narrative from Malachy himself; but the larger portion was furnished by an Irish abbot named Congan,[1] at whose request he engaged in its composition. Whilst the mind of his biographer was beclouded by superstition, both his informants were extremely credulous, and both were prepared to give a very partial account of passing occurrences. As might have been expected, Bernard's production is one-sided; so that from it we can form a most imperfect estimate of the state of matters in Ireland at the time when it was written.

Malachy was born about A.D. 1095. He was the son of an Irish clergyman—a theological professor in the monastery of Armagh. Bernard does not record this fact; and others have attempted its concealment; but it can be clearly established by the evidence of the native annals.[2] Malachy is said to have been of noble lineage; and the situation held by his father was one of high respectability; as the *lecturer* at Armagh was next in dignity to the abbot.[3] His mother was

[1] He is said to have been abbot of Surium. Lanigan, iv. 128, 130. This place seems to have been somewhere near the river Suir. Bernard expressly tells us that his materials were furnished by Congan. "Praefatio ad finem." According to some, Congan was abbot of Bangor. See O'Hanlon's *Life of Malachy*, p. 3, *note*. Dublin, 1859.

[2] His father's name was Muron O'Morgair. He died when Malachy was about seven years of age. As to the evidence that Muron was a clergyman, see King's *Memoir of the Primacy*, p. 87. Muron had another son, named Christian, who was bishop of Clogher.

[3] "The *Fearleighlinn*, or *Lector*, was the chief superintendent in the monastic school of those studies which were there cultivated; and among which theology, or the elements of the Christian religion, and especially a knowledge of the Word of God, held a first place."—KING'S *Memoir*, p. 87. In A.D. 1049, on the death of *Abbot* Awley, the Fearleighlinn or Lector, was raised to the abbacy, and the *bishop*

an excellent Christian lady, to whom he was greatly indebted for his early training. He was an apt scholar; and, when still a youth, he was brought under the influence of Ivar O'Hegan, an ascetic who lived in a cell at Armagh. We know little of the history of this devotee; but he was evidently a man of austere character, and an enthusiastic admirer of the Romanism then about to gain predominance in Ireland.[1] His tuition soon gave a decided bent to the mind of his disciple. Religion was at a low ebb in the place; and there were few anywhere who could distinguish between the genial piety of the New Testament, and the foolish mortifications of the cloister. The well-meaning Malachy regarded the self-imposed fasts and vigils of Ivar as so many proofs that the truth was on his side; imitated his example; and became himself more narrow-minded.

In due time Malachy became a deacon,[2] and afterwards a priest. When little more than five-and-twenty years of age, he was appointed by Celsus of Armagh to act as his vicar. He entered on the duties thus committed to him with amazing energy; and, if we are to credit the report of his biographer, soon effected a marked improvement in the state of the churches throughout the diocese. "He established," says Bernard, "the *customs of the holy Roman Church* in the whole of the churches. . . . Malachy instituted anew the most salutary use of Confession, the Sacrament of Confirmation, and the marriage contract—all of which were either unknown to them, or neglected."[3]

The young minister appears soon to have discovered that something more than zeal was required for the work he had undertaken. The ritual he condemned had been celebrated for centuries by scholars and divines—not a few of whom were greatly superior to himself. There were, no doubt, many

---

to the Lectorship, which so fell vacant."—King's *Memoir*, p. 78. At this time the bishop was two degrees inferior to the abbot.

[1] It appears from the *Annals of the Four Masters* that in A.D. 1134 he finished his career in Rome, where he had gone on a pilgrimage.

[2] When a deacon he is said to have taken special pleasure in attending to the burial of the poor; and we may infer from the narrative that he frequently performed the humble office of grave-digger. *Life* by Bernard, chap. iii.

[3] *Vita S. Malachiae*, cap. iii.

who disapproved of his proceedings, who could not recognise the wisdom of his new arrangements, who put to him questions he could not answer, and suggested difficulties he could not solve. Bernard, indeed, represents his labours as singularly successful; but facts are mentioned by him incidentally, which show that his statements are rather highly coloured. Malachy himself, it appears, at length became so sensible of his own deficiencies that he withdrew, for several years, from the discharge of ministerial duty, and meanwhile sought instruction from Malchus, the aged bishop of Lismore. This ecclesiastic, as already stated, had been originally bishop of the town of Waterford; but he had obtained from the Synod of Rathbreasail an enlargement of his jurisdiction; and he now ruled over the diocese to which the town belonged.[1] He was, as we have seen, a great stickler for Romanism; he was well acquainted with the arguments by which its polity and worship could be most plausibly defended; and at this time the young ecclesiastic from Armagh seems to have spent no less than four years under his tuition.[2]

During his residence at Lismore, Malachy became acquainted with Cormac Mac Carthy, King of Desmond. This prince had been driven from his throne by Turlogh O'Conor, King of Connaught; and, in the day of his adversity, had sought the protection of Malchus, and had devoted himself to monastic exercises. By the advice of the bishop of Lismore Malachy was selected as his spiritual guide. Cormac and the young minister soon became most attached friends; and Bernard relates, with special satisfaction, how the dethroned monarch lived on bread and salt, and extinguished the lusts of the flesh by a daily bath of cold water.[3] Cormac soon recovered his kingdom, and afterwards was of great service to his spiritual director.

The youthful ecclesiastic was at length recalled from Lismore to take charge of the abbacy of Bangor. The monastery of that place had been destroyed by the Northmen; Malachy

[1] Lismore now included the diocese of Waterford.

[2] That is, from A.D. 1123 to A.D. 1127. See Lanigan, iv. 73, 76.

[3] *Vita S. Malachiae*, cap. iv.

zealously addressed himself to the task of its renovation; and, according to his biographer, soon restored it to a prosperous condition. But, in a short time, he was removed from Bangor to the bishopric of Connor. The account given by Bernard of his labours in this new sphere is a very fair specimen of the style and spirit in which the whole narrative is written. "Consecrated bishop about the thirtieth year of his age,"[1] says his friend, "Malachy is introduced into Connor —for that is the name of the city.[2] But when he began to engage in the duties of his office, then the man of God saw plainly that he had received a commission, not to men, but to beasts. Nowhere had he met such people in any locality, however barbarous. Nowhere had he found people so haughty in their manners, so coarse in their rites, so impious in regard to faith, so barbarous in their laws, so stiff-necked against discipline, filthy in their lives, Christians in name, pagans in reality. They paid neither tithes nor first fruits,[3] they entered not into legitimate marriages, nor did they attend to confession. None at all could be found who either sought, or imposed penance. Of ministers of the altar there were very few. But what need of more when even these few had almost nothing to do amongst the laity? No opportunity was afforded them of realizing fruit from their offices among the people. Not even in the churches was the voice either of preacher, or of chanter, to be heard. What was the champion of the Lord to do? He must either ignominiously leave the field, or engage with peril in the conflict. But he who was conscious that he was the shepherd, and not a hireling, chose rather to stand his ground than to flee—ready even, if need be, to lay down his life for the sheep. And though all were wolves and none sheep, the intrepid pastor stood in the midst of the wolves, endeavouring by arguments of every kind to convert the wolves into sheep."[4]

---

[1] He was now probably about thirty-two. See Lanigan, iv. 87, 88.

[2] Connor, now a poor village about four miles from Ballymena, was then a town of considerable importance.

[3] The mention of tithes and first fruits in the *Senchus Mor.* (vol. i. p. 51) suggests that, at least some parts of it, do not possess the antiquity claimed for it.

[4] *Vita S. Malachiae*, cap. viii.

The piety which Malachy estimated most highly was essentially monkish and artificial. His standard of excellence was derived, not from the New Testament, but from the teachings of Ivar O'Hegan and Malchus of Waterford. Thus it was that the people of Connor appeared to him to be in such a deplorable condition. Notwithstanding the denunciations of Bernard, there may, after all, have been some true godliness among them—though there was no high-flown ritualism, and certainly very little of what Anselm would have called "Canonical religion." In the passage just quoted, the complaint in reference to wedlock—so often urged by the Romish party against the people of Ireland—is repeated. Bernard, it is to be observed, does not say exactly that they did not respect the nuptial tie; he states simply that they did not enter into "*legitimate* marriages."[1] This cautious style of expression may well suggest that the case was not altogether so bad as his language may at first appear to indicate. It can easily be shown that the Irish observed the institution of marriage; but it is probable that at this time they contracted matrimonial engagements in the way of espousals or betrothment, and not by a form of words immediately and indissolubly binding pronounced in the presence of witnesses.[2] In all likelihood the mode recommended by Malachy was preferable; but the Irish marriages should not have been designated *illegitimate* because they did not happen to be in accordance with the decisions of canon law. We have seen, too, that Rome had prohibited marriages in cases where the divine statute-book has imposed no restriction; and if so, the Irish should not have been branded as infamous, because they did not conform to regulations which were unscriptural and unwarrantable.

Many of the charges contained in Bernard's indictment against the people of Connor are of a very vague character. Their views of duty differed widely from those cherished by the abbot of Clairvaux; and if they believed that Malachy was disfiguring their ancient worship and introducing foolish novelties, no wonder that they looked at him disdainfully, and

[1] "Non *legitima* inire conjugia."

[2] This subject is well illustrated by Dr. Lanigan in his *Ecc. Hist.*, iv. 64, 70.

that they were "stiff-necked against discipline." It may be that they had no taste for the chanting of unintelligible Latin, and no relish for prayers in an unknown tongue. They may have been excellent Christians, and yet may have protested against changes of which the bishop was an advocate. The primitive saints paid neither tithes nor first-fruits, nor received confirmation, nor practised penance, nor went to confession. The teaching of Malachy was certainly very different from the teaching of Paul and Peter: for they preached, saying, "Repent ye, and believe the gospel"—whereas the burden of the bishop's message was—"Pay tithes, do penance, and obey the Pope."

In A.D. 1129, when Celsus, Archbishop of Armagh, was on a visit in Munster, he took ill and died. When he saw that he was not likely to survive, he made a species of will—apparently at the instigation of the leaders of the Romish party in the South—in which he nominated Malachy as his successor; and appointed Cormac MacCarthy, King of Desmond, and Coner O'Brien, King of Munster, as executors, to carry out its provisions.[1] The dying Primate had evidently no right to dictate this arrangement. No law, human or divine, had given him such authority. But, as it was known that the family which had so long enjoyed the co-arbship would assert its claims, and as Malachy had an extraordinary reputation for sanctity, his friends reckoned that he might be able to make a successful stand against any rival candidate. It soon appeared that the concoctors of this scheme had entirely miscalculated. No sooner was the demise of Celsus known in the North, than an individual, named Murtogh, entered Armagh, and successfully asserted his title to the vacant dignity. Murtogh—who was a member of the family so long in possession—maintained his position till his death—an event which took place five years afterwards.[2]

Bernard tells us that Celsus, on his death-bed, desired his staff, or crozier—the symbol of his office—to be transmitted to Malachy, as soon as he expired.[3] This relic—known as the

---

[1] *Vita S. Malachiae*, cap. x.

[2] See Lanigan, iv. 91.

[3] *Vita S. Malachiae*, cap. x.

Staff of Jesus, as has been already mentioned—was regarded with wonderful reverence all over Ireland. The individual who had it in his keeping was believed to be the true successor of the Apostle of Ireland. It seems on this occasion to have been duly conveyed to the bishop of Connor; but it was not long permitted to remain in his custody. Conor O'Lochlainn, King of Leath Cuinn, indignant, as it would appear, at the attempt to dispose in this way of the co-arbship, hastened with an army into Dalaradia, seized the crozier,[1] and drove Malachy and one hundred and thirty of his monks out of the country. The bishop, in his distress, retired, with his companions to Munster; where he was very kindly received by his old friend, King Cormac MacCarthy.[2] When he had remained about three years in the South, the contrivers of the scheme for destroying the prescriptive claim to the co-arbship became impatient; and insisted that he must, at all hazards, assert his title. In a monastery which he had erected at Ibrach, or Iveragh, in the county of Kerry,[3] he was waited on by a deputation consisting of King Cormac MacCarthy, King Coner O'Brien, Malchus of Lismore, and Gillebert the Papal legate, who reproached him for his inactivity, and threatened him with excommunication if he continued any longer to procrastinate.[4] It was impossible for such a man as Malachy to resist this appeal. Encouraged by assurances of support from his two royal visitors, and stirred up, partly by the exhortations of his old teacher Malchus, and partly by the denunciations of the Pope's representative, he was obliged to give way. He accordingly returned to the North, and attempted, as far as circumstances permitted, to perform the duties of a metropolitan: but he did not dare to approach Armagh; for he well knew that Murtogh, who had possession of the Staff

[1] It is evident that the crozier must have been taken from Malachy at this time, as we find it afterwards in the possession of his rival. Bernard takes no notice of this awkward seizure. As to this attack of King Conor on Dalaradia, or Co. Down, see King's *Memoir.* Introd. to *Hist. of Primacy*, pp. 94, 95. See also Lanigan, iv. 90.

[2] This prince, according to some, built, and according to others, renovated the beautiful chapel at Cashel called by his name. See Keane's *Towers and Temples of Ancient Ireland*, pp. 3, 4.

[3] See Lanigan, iv. 92.

[4] *Vita S. Malachiae*, cap. x.

of Jesus, and who was, in consequence, recognised as co-arb, would have forcibly opposed his entrance.[1] On the death of this rival in A.D. 1134, Niell, or Nigellus, a brother of Celsus, the former Primate, immediately claimed the office; and as he held the Staff of Jesus, contrived for a time successfully to assert his title. But he was very soon obliged to yield. In that year the two Southern Princes, Coner O'Brien and Cormac MacCarthy, "marched at the head of a great army" into Ulster;[2] and it would seem that, under the protection of these two royal patrons, Malachy was established in the Primacy of Armagh.

The bishop of Connor was exceedingly unwilling to accept this elevation. He saw that he could not obtain it without bloodshed; and he recoiled at the thought of paying such a price for its possession. But, in the end, he was obliged to submit to this alternative; and he was seated in Armagh at the expense of a civil war. Bernard himself admits that Malachy was compelled to resort to violence before Niell could be put down. "He did," says he, "so closely hedge him about in all his paths, through the grace given him of God, and the favour he enjoyed with all, that the malignant was *forced to submit*, give up the insignia, and afterwards keep quiet in all subjection."[3] The abbot here reports incorrectly the termination of the controversy; as it appears that the bishop at length made a compromise with his rival, and paid him a stipulated sum for surrendering the crozier. Instead of denouncing it as a piece of trumpery or superstition, Malachy evidently valued it at least as highly as did Niell. When the bargain was concluded, he was directed to a place where it was hidden;[4] and, armed with this badge of office, he seems to have henceforward met with little resistance.

Malachy was not a lover of wealth, neither did he ever

---

[1] See King's *Memoir*, p. 102.

[2] See interpolated *Annals of Innisfallen* at A.D. 1134, as quoted by King in his *Memoir*, p. 96.

[3] *Vita S. Malachiae*, cap. xii.

[4] We read in the *Annals of the Four Masters*, at A.D. 1135:—"Maelmaedhog Ua Morgair, successor of Patrick, *purchased the Bachall Isa*, and took it from its cave, on the 7th day of the month of July."

betray any anxiety for ecclesiastical promotion. Had he rightly understood the glorious Gospel, he might have been an invaluable blessing to his generation; for he was acute, laborious, upright, zealous, and intrepid. He seems to have had a bland address, as well as a kindly disposition; and he was not wanting in ready eloquence. But he was essentially a monk—of contracted information and contracted intellect. The world in which he moved was a region of austerity and formalism, rather than a kingdom of righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. He had been taught by Ivar and Malchus to believe that the Pope was the Vicar of Christ, and he looked to Rome as to the City of God. Ireland, he thought, could not prosper until it was more closely connected with the Sovereign Pontiff. Thus, misguided by false lights, this good man ardently promoted measures which soon terminated in the enslavement of his Church and his country.

The new metropolitan remained, it appears, but three years at Armagh. He had declared that he would occupy the place only till his title was securely established; and, as soon as rival claimants disappeared, he resigned the dignity, and consecrated a monk, named Gelasius, his successor. As another bishop had been meanwhile settled at Connor, he took charge of the diocese of Down; wishing, as he said, to divide the *parishes* "which ambition had joined into one."[1] This, it must be confessed, is a pitiful apology; for he must have known that, not long before, many parishes had been united to form the bishopric of Down.[2] But he had no idea of breaking up the diocesan system established, under Romish auspices, by the Synod of Rathbreasail.

After some time a new idea took possession of the busy mind of the bishop of Down. He was intensely desirous to see the Pope; and he soon discovered an urgent reason which required his presence in the ecclesiastical capital of Italy. As he was employed, according to his biographer, "in de-

[1] *Vita S. Malachiae*, cap. xiv. Down and Connor seem to have been united after Malachy resigned the latter.

[2] Thus, in the district formed into the diocese of Down by the Synod of Rathbreasail, there had existed the bishoprics of Downpatrick, Bright, Raholp, Bangor, Maghera, Nendrum, Maghbile, and probably several others.

termining and disposing of matters ecclesiastical," it occurred to him that it was "not sufficiently safe to proceed in such undertakings without the authority of the Apostolic See."[1] The Church of Ireland had hitherto wanted this sanction, and it had meanwhile been known as the light of Europe; it had sent forth Columbkille to evangelize Caledonia, and Columbanus to rebuke the Pope; but poor Malachy was blind to such considerations; for a false professional training had beclouded his intellect, and quenched his patriotism. Ireland had now two Archbishops; but neither was yet formally bound to obey the so-called representative of Saint Peter. A pallium—the sign of archiepiscopal subserviency to Rome—had never yet been seen in the country; and the indefatigable Malachy resolved to try to complete the organization of the Irish Church by applying in person for a grant of this piece of pontifical finery. He accordingly set out on a journey to Rome. On his way there, as well as on his return homewards, he stopped at Clairvaux, where he had much pleasant intercourse with its far-famed abbot. He was so delighted with the discipline of Bernard's monastery, that he determined to introduce it into his native land. Shortly afterwards, the Cistercians appeared in Ireland; and, in A.D. 1142, an abbey —said to be the first belonging to that order erected in this country—was founded under royal auspices at Mellifont.[2]

The arrival of Malachy in Rome gave unbounded satisfaction to the Pope. Innocent II., who then filled the Pontifical chair, had, no doubt, been duly apprized of the approach of

---

[1] *Vita S. Malachiae*, cap. xiv-xv.

[2] Lanigan, iv. 117, 119. Mellifont was in what is now the County of Louth. This abbey was endowed by Donagh O'Carrol, King of Ergall or Oriel. When speaking on this subject, Bernard intimates that the Irish had never before "*seen a monk.*" Chap. xvi. "It is worthy of remark," says King, "that we read but little of monks under that name (*manach*) in the early Irish Annals *before the twelfth century*, the various individuals of note, whose obits occur in them being called rather by such names as seniors, sages (*seanoir*, *sruith*, or *saei*) &c.; whereas the name (*manach*) of monk is applied to those foreign ones introduced by Maolmogue, &c., very commonly." King's *Memoir*. Introd. p. 99. The consecration of the Church of Mellifont, in A.D. 1157, was a very splendid ceremony, attended by four kings and seventeen diocesan bishops. See *Annals of the Four Masters*, at A.D. 1157.

this extraordinary Irishman; he had been told of his wonderful sanctity, and of his fame as a worker of miracles;[1] of his remarkable influence with his countrymen, and of his devotion to the interests of the Papacy. He did not fail to bestow very signal tokens of regard on the honest devotee. Malachy remained a month in Rome; and meanwhile visited the holy places—at once to satisfy his curiosity and to engage in his devotions. He was frequently admitted to the presence of the Pope, with whom he had many interesting conversations. But, withal, he did not forget that he had certain petitions to present; and, in due time, he announced his errand. He desired that the establishment of the new archbishopric in the South of Ireland should be confirmed, and that palls should be granted to the two metropolitans of Armagh and Cashel. The Pontiff readily complied with the first request—for he thereby conceded nothing; but he saw that he might commit a very grave blunder by conceding the second. Malachy had not been commissioned by the Church of Ireland to make any such application; and it was therefore scarcely safe to bestow what had never been solicited. The Irish might refuse to accept the gift; and thus the head of the Roman Church would be exposed to a public indignity. He accordingly informed Malachy that, in a concern of such gravity, he must adopt a different method of procedure. "As to the palls," said he, "it is necessary to act in a more solemn manner. Call together a general Council of the bishops, clergy, and nobles of your country; and so, with the concurrence and common desire of all, make application for the palls through persons of respectability, and you shall obtain them." As Gillebert of Limerick had become infirm, the Pope had, some days before, appointed Malachy his legate for all Ireland.[2] But a more signal honour yet awaited him. Rising from his

[1] It is strange that sober men can receive as *miracles* some of the exploits of Malachy. Thus Bernard tells how, on passing through Scotland, on his return from Rome, he found the king's son ill, and sprinkled him with water. *The following day* the youth recovered. Cap. xvii. Might he not have recovered *next day* had Malachy never seen him? Some of the other miracles ascribed to Malachy are of a very suspicious character.

[2] *Vita S. Malachiae*, cap. xvi.

seat, Innocent took off his mitre, and placed it on the head of his Irish visitor. At the same time he presented him with the maniple and stole which he used when officiating.[1] He then gave him the kiss of peace and his apostolic benediction. When all this was going forward, we can well imagine that Malachy must have been in an ecstacy of joy, not well knowing whether he was in the body or out of the body.

Malachy returned to Ireland in A.D. 1140, and devoted himself most assiduously to the performance of his various ecclesiastical duties. His biographer tells how, in company with a number of his clergy, he travelled everywhere on foot—thus exhibiting to all, as he conceived, an example of apostolic humility.[2] As papal legate he held synods, administered discipline, and, no doubt, laboured to promote the adoption of the Romish ritual. He had been so captivated with what he saw of the Cistercian brotherhood in France that, when at Rome, he sought permission from the Pope to live and die at Clairvaux; but Innocent refused to accede to the request, knowing well that the bishop of Down could promote his interests much better as his legate in Ireland than as a recluse in a Gallic monastery. Malachy did not neglect, on his return home, to patronize the system he admired so enthusiastically. Six Cistercian abbeys, including Mellifont, were soon established in Ireland.[3] In one of his letters the abbot of Clairvaux exhorts his Irish correspondent to take care of the brethren, and intimates that monasticism—properly so called—had been hitherto unknown in Hibernia. "There

---

[1] *Vita S. Malachiae*, cap. xvi.

[2] *Vita*, cap. xix.

[3] See Lanigan, iv. 120. It is said that some Cistercians were introduced into Mary's Abbey, Dublin, in A.D. 1139—that is, three years before the erection of Mellifont. *Brenan*, p. 259. It was the opinion of O'Donovan that "there is not a single church to be found in Ireland dedicated to the Blessed Virgin of an earlier age than the twelfth century." Petrie concurred in this view.—STOKES's *Life of Petrie*, p. 199. Mary's Abbey, Dublin, was erected by the Danes; but it was certainly not of earlier origin than the date here assigned. See *Brenan*, p. 259. According to Archdall, the Cistercian Abbey of Boyle, in County Roscommon, was a daughter of Mellifont. The monks were originally placed at Grelachdinach, but removed to Boyle in A.D. 1161. The Abbey Church of Boyle was consecrated in A.D. 1218. *Monasticon Hibernicum*, p. 602. Dublin, 1786.

is," says he, "still need of great watchfulness, as, in a new place, and in *a land unaccustomed to monastic religion, yea, that has never had any experience therein*, we beseech you in the Lord not to withdraw your hand, but rather what you have begun well, to finish to perfection."[1] Irish monachism had hitherto been, to a considerable extent, associated with literature and intellectual development; but the austerities of the Cistercian discipline had a direct tendency to debilitate the understanding.[2] From this date till the seventeenth century, Ireland had an unhappy celebrity as a land of ignorance, barbarism, and crime.

We have seen that the Irish abbot Sedulius in the ninth century, when expounding the doctrine of the Eucharist, uses much the same language as would now be employed by any Protestant commentator.[3] Two hundred years afterwards, Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury, signalized himself as one of the great champions of the dogma of transubstantiation. He had kept up a correspondence with certain of the Irish bishops; and the opinion of so eminent a divine had probably produced an impression on the public mind in this country. But, even in the days of Malachy, some respectable Irish theologians refused to swallow this monstrous absurdity. On a visit to the South, the bishop of Down encountered one of its impugners. "There was in Lismore," says Bernard, "a certain clergyman of exemplary life, as it is said, but whose faith was of a different character. He, being wise in his own eyes, presumed to say that in the Eucharist there is but a sacrament, and not the thing betokened by a sacrament, that is, only a consecration, and not the real body. On which subject, having been spoken to by Malachy in private, and that repeatedly, but all to no purpose, he is summoned to a

---

[1] See Ussher's *Sylloge*. Epistle xliv. Works, iv. 541.

[2] The privations endured by Bernard and his companions, when the Abbey of Clairvaux was established, were almost unparalleled. "A coarse bread made of barley and millet, and beech leaves cooked in salt and water, formed their only nourishment; and this too at the beginning of the winter season." Bernard himself, then in his 26th year, was "so emaciated as rather to resemble a corpse than a living man." *Life and Times of St. Bernard*, by Neander, p. 15. London, 1843.

[3] See before, p. 133-4.

public inquiry, apart, however, from the laity, that he might, if possible, be brought to amendment, and not to confusion. In a meeting, therefore, of the clergy, the man was given opportunity to answer in defence of his opinion. And when he attempted, with all the power of a genius of no mean order, to assert and defend his erroneous views; and when Malachy disputed against them, and exposed their unsoundness; he left the meeting—overcome in the judgment of all present—confounded, indeed, but not amended. He said that he was not beaten by reasoning, but overpowered by the bishop's authority."[1] Malachy then hurled against him the sentence of excommunication. This, at the period before us, was something more than a spiritual award; it was equivalent to outlawry—involving exclusion from all the charities of life, as well as from church fellowship. Even excommunication produced no effect on the disputant. "It is the man you are all favouring rather than the truth," exclaimed the condemned clergyman in presence of the assembled bishops. "No respect, however, for persons shall influence me to forsake the truth."[2] According to Bernard, this obstinate heretic was, in the end, reclaimed. He took sick; was seized with terrors of conscience; retracted his error; received absolution; and died immediately afterwards. This part of the story has very much the appearance of a monkish fable, added to garnish the rest of the narrative. There is ample evidence that, in the twelfth century, the invention of an embellishment of this description was deemed a very venial transgression.

As we read this biography it is difficult to avoid the conviction that the whole is rather a panegyric than an unvarnished narrative. Malachy is a man without faults; and his life is a career of ecclesiastical and spiritual victories. But facts occasionally ooze out which may well shake our confidence in these glowing representations. Malachy, for example, claims nothing of the temporalities of the abbacy of Bangor; and yet the hereditary co-arb of Comghall, on whom he had bestowed all the property, evidently disliked exceedingly the proximity of any such neighbour. Even the co-arb's

[1] *Vita S. Malachiae*, cap. xxvi. [2] *Ibid.*

son derided and denounced his generous benefactor.[1] Malachy is the admiration of all—both clergy and laity—and his will is a law to them; and yet, though full of ardour, he is singularly slow in accomplishing his cherished purposes. He was instructed by the Pope to call a Council on his return to Ireland, and formally solicit the palls; and yet years pass away before we hear again of any such application. He was meanwhile moving throughout the island clothed with all the authority that his commission as papal legate could confer; he was holding meetings of clergy and laity in various places; but it is not till eight years afterwards that we hear of the first movement with a view to the attainment of the papal distinction. We are told that, in A.D. 1148, a synod, consisting of fifteen bishops and 200 priests, was held at Inis-Patrick,[2] where it was agreed that he should return to Rome to seek the palls from Pope Eugenius III. The account of this affair which has come down to us is fitted to generate a suspicion as to the anxiety of the Irish Church to obtain the favour. Little more than one-half of the diocesan prelates recently appointed were present on the occasion. The synod, we are assured, was most reluctant to permit Malachy to attempt such a perilous journey, and proposed that some one else should be employed;[3] and yet we are not informed that any other was willing to undertake the errand. Few, perhaps, felt inclined directly to oppose the proposition; but we can scarcely avoid the conclusion that Malachy himself was throughout the great mover in the affair, and that he found it no easy matter to induce his brethren to sympathise with him in his anxiety for the procurement of the palls.

Furnished with a commission from the synod, he at length set out to visit the Pope—expecting to find him in France, where he was then the guest of Bernard, his old master.[4]

[1] *Vita S. Malachiæ*, cap. xxviii.

[2] *Annals of the Four Masters*, at. A.D. 1148. Inis-Patrick is Patrick's Island, near Skerries, in the County of Dublin—certainly an odd place for such a meeting.

[3] *Vita S. Malachiae*, cap. xxx.

[4] Eugenius, before his election to the Papal chair, had been the abbot of a Cistercian monastery at Rome. Many of the disciples of the abbot of Clairvaux occupied the highest offices in the Church.

Shortly after the commencement of his journey, Malachy was unexpectedly detained in England; and Eugenius had meanwhile returned to Italy. As he proceeded on his way, the Irish traveller stopped to rest a short time at Clairvaux; but it soon appeared that he had now reached the end of his earthly pilgrimage. He had been only a few days in the monastery when he was seized with a fever which proved fatal. He died on the 2nd of November, 1148, in the fifty-fourth year of his age.

Few men have ever exercised such influence in the Church of Ireland as Malachy O'Morgair. His distinguished birth, his mortified life, his restless activity, and his high official position, all contributed to give him importance. He cannot claim credit either for learning or sagacity; and yet it must be acknowledged that he was consistent and single-minded. He was the victim of false principles. His reputation for piety greatly recommended him to his countrymen; and ecclesiastics more designing than himself employed him as a tool for effecting changes which they could not themselves have accomplished. His *Life* by Bernard has thrown a deceitful halo around his character. The miracles ascribed to him are sustained by no proper evidence;[1] most of them are recorded by his biographer as they were reported to him by Congan; and the Irish abbot seems to have picked up without caution the hearsays which were current among his credulous contemporaries. A goodly number of the incidents related by the biographer cannot be called miracles at all; they are simply striking providences such as we see continually occurring. Malachy cannot be considered a Christian patriot; but he is unquestionably a Romish saint. In A.D. 1190 he

[1] His biographer tells how a boy, who had been *brought from a great distance* and whose arm was palsied, was immediately healed by touching Malachy's dead body. Bernard, who informs us that he witnessed this miracle, seems to have known nothing of this strange youth. At this very time, one of Bernard's monks, who acted as his secretary, and in whom he placed unbounded confidence, was a most atrocious scoundrel. It is quite possible that this man induced the youth to pretend that his arm was palsied to gratify Bernard, and enhance the reputation of the monastery by the alleged cure. See Neander's *Life and Times of St. Bernard*, pp. 284-5, *note*.

was canonized by Pope Clement III.; and he is said to have been the first Irishman who spent his days in his native land, and who attained that distinction.[1]

After the death of Malachy, no farther movement was made, on the part of the Irish Church, in reference to the palls. Pope Eugenius at length deemed it prudent to take a step in advance, and to send a commissioner into this country. In the autumn of A.D. 1151 Cardinal Paparo accordingly arrived, and remained here nearly six months. The appointment of a "Prince of the Church" to this service, attests the importance attached to it. Paparo seems to have been well fitted for his delicate mission; and, during his stay in the kingdom, he had ample time to make himself acquainted with its ecclesiastical and political condition. Malachy had contemplated the acquisition of only *two* palls—the first for Armagh, and the second for Cashel; but other parties in Ireland, who took a different view of the affair, had been in correspondence with the Roman Court, and had insisted on a more liberal distribution of pontifical honours. The result was that the chief towns of Leinster and Connaught were included in the arrangement; and that the Cardinal came prepared to bestow *four* palls—to be given to Armagh, Cashel, Dublin, and Tuam. In March 1152 a great synod assembled at Kells in Meath, attended by twenty-two bishops "with three hundred ecclesiastics, both monks and canons."[2] Cardinal Paparo presided, assisted by Christian of Lismore—who had been nominated papal legate for Ireland as successor to Malachy. The bestowal of the palls is said to have been the first business transacted on the occasion.[3]

Before the opening of the synod, the intentions of Paparo appear to have transpired. His arrival in Ireland so long

[1] Erard, who is said to have died in the beginning of the eighth century, was canonised by Pope Leo IX. in A.D. 1052; but he spent many years of his life on the continent and died in Bavaria. See Lanigan, iii. 105, 106.

[2] *Annals of the Four Masters*, at A.D. 1152. The sees represented in this Synod were those of Lismore, Armagh, Cashel, Dublin, Glendaloch, Leighlin, Waterford, Ossory, Kildare, Emly, Cork, Kerry, Limerick, Clonmacnois, Roscommon, Achonry, Ardagh, Clonard, Enaghdune, Tyrone, Connor, and Down. See King's *Memoir*, p. 105.

[3] Brenan's *Ecc. Hist.*, p. 230.

prior to the meeting gave him time to make arrangements for conciliating opposition; but, notwithstanding, he did not succeed in securing the cordial co-operation of the northern clergy. Few of them consented to be present; and, with the exception of Gelasius of Armagh—who seems to have been almost as devoted to the Pope as his predecessor Malachy—the few who attended were dissatisfied.[1] Until lately they could boast of the co-arb of Patrick as the chief of Irish churchmen; but all recent changes had tended to curtail his jurisdiction; and men who remembered with pride his ancient ascendency viewed with impatience his diminishing authority. The erection of the two new archbishoprics involved additional encroachments; as the supervision of a large part of Leinster and of the whole of Connaught[2] was thus transferred to others. Even Gelasius himself must have felt that, in the synod of Kells, he did not hold the position to which he was entitled.[3] He had not even the second place in that assembly—as a southern bishop, in the capacity of Papal legate, presided along with Cardinal Paparo. The synod sought to comfort him by passing a resolution in which he was officially acknowledged as the Irish *Primate;* but this compliment was a poor equivalent for a substantial loss in power and prestige.

By the synod of Rathbreasail the island had been divided into six-and-twenty dioceses.[4] This partition had been very imperfectly carried out; many whose sees were thus doomed to extinction gave it opposition; and there is reason to believe that multitudes of bishops still flourished.[5] To appease the

[1] Keating says:—"It was *in defiance of the clergy of Armagh and Down* especially, that there were given out any more than the two palls mentioned, as is indicated in the ancient book of the *Annals of Clonenagh*." See King's *Memoir*, pp. 104-5.

[2] At this time the whole of Connaught was in Leith Cuinn. See before, p. 180, *note* (1).

[3] If, as has been asserted, "the Archbishop of Dublin was the first invested with the pall by Cardinal Paparo," Gelasius might well have been offended. See D'Alton's *Archbishops of Dublin*, p. 464.

[4] That is, reckoning the diocese of Dublin.

[5] Thus the see of Dromore is unnoticed in the acts of Rathbreasail and Kells, and yet it still maintained its existence. This small see, extending over less than a seventieth part of the area of Ireland, formerly contained at least three bishoprics, viz:—Dromore, Donaghmore, and Magheralin. See Reeves's *Antiq. of Down, Connor and Dromore*, pp. 127, 306. In the diocese of Dublin, there appear to

more influential of the malcontents, the scheme of distribution adopted at Rathbreasail was enlarged; and no less than thirty-eight[1] dioceses were now constituted. The synod knew, from experience, that it would be vain to attempt to interfere with the existing parochial bishops; but a plan was laid for the gradual suppression of these dignitaries. It was ruled[2] that

have been formerly at least fourteen bishoprics, viz :—Dublin, Swords, Lusk, Finglass, Newcastle, Tawney, Leixlip, Bray, Wicklow, Arklow, Ballymore, Clondalkin, Tallaght and O'Murthy. See Ledwich, p. 82.

[1] The following was the plan of distribution :—1st, under the Archbishop of Armagh—Connor, Down, Louth or Clogher, Clonard, Kells, Ardagh, Raphoe, Rathlury or Maghera, Duleek, Derry; 2nd, under the Archbishop of Dublin—Glendalagh, Ferns, Ossory, Leighlin, Kildare; 3rd, under the Archbishop of Cashel—Killaloe, Limerick, Iniscathy, Kilfenoragh, Emly, Roscrea, Waterford, Lismore, Cloyne, Cork, Ross, Ardfert; 4th, under the Archbishop of Tuam—Mayo, Killala, Roscommon, Clonfert, Achonry, Clonmacnois, Galway or Kilmacogh. See King's *Memoir*, pp. 105 6. It is said that thirty-eight Irish sees paid dues to Rome, according to the Papal tax-rolls, as late as A.D. 1220. Ledwich, *Antiq.* pp. 131, 132. See also Bingham, iii. 172.

[2] "Ut decedentibus chorepiscopis, et exiliorum sedium episcopis in Hibernia, in eorum locum eligerentur et succederent archipresbyteri a diocesanis constituendi, qui cleri et plebis solicitudinem gerant infra suos limites, et ut eorum sedes in totidem capita decanatuum ruralium erigerentur."—WILKINS' *Concilia*, i. 547. This is perhaps the first instance in which the word *chorepiscopus* occurs in Irish ecclesiastical literature. According to the report of the Census Commissioners of 1861 the following are the areas, in statute acres, of the Irish dioceses :—

	Statute acres.		Statute acres.
Armagh	869,770	Ferns	616,200
Clogher	889 682	Leighlin	524,766
Meath	1,246,995	Cashel	507,323
Derry	1,060,466	Emly	257,786
Raphoe	885 430	Waterford	66,857
Down	356,188	Lismore	573,803
Connor	785,274	Cork	659,097
Dromore	288,512	Cloyne	830,966
Kilmore	738,503	Ross	254,197
Elphin	730,885	Killaloe	1,038,125
Ardagh	490,232	Kilfenora	135,746
Tuam	1,686,986	Clonfert	394,320
Killala	631,361	Kilmacduagh	139,660
Achonry	368,358	Limerick	506,222
Dublin and Glandelagh	777,043	Ardfert and Aghadoe	1,263,795
Kildare	505,117		20,701,346
Ossory	604,281		

It thus appears that the dioceses were of very unequal extent. Tuam is more than twenty-five times the extent of Waterford. There are at present several parishes

"on the death of village bishops, and of bishops who possessed small sees in Ireland, there should be chosen to succeed in their stead archpresbyters, to be appointed by the diocesans, who should superintend the clergy and laity in their respective districts; and that their sees should be erected into so many heads of rural deaneries."

Several other regulations were made by the synod of Kells. These are very vaguely recorded; but it seems probable that one of them was intended to put an end to the marriage of the clergy.[1] As the chief object of the convocation is said to have been "to exhibit a manifestation of the catholic faith and set it forth in its purity,"[2] we may be sure that stringent rules were made for the observance of the Romish ritual. We are told more distinctly that orders were now given, "by apostolic authority, for the payment of tithes."[3] Other canons are said to have been framed against usury and simony. Immediately after the close of the meeting, the Cardinal took his departure for Rome.

It is remarkable that the native annalists generally pass over in silence the most important arrangements adopted by the great Irish synods in the twelfth century. They report that these conventions assembled, and that they were numerously attended; but, with few exceptions, they describe the business transacted in them in language so indefinite that the reader can form no clear idea of its actual character. These annalists were monks—most of them devoted to the interests of the Church of Rome; and they were obviously unwilling to register proceedings which show that the polity and worship of the Church of Ireland now passed through a process of transformation. It is very plain that the change

---

each larger than the diocese of Waterford—which is less than the 300th part of the surface of Ireland.

[1] Moore says:—"Besides the distribution of the palliums, the chief affairs that appear to have occupied the attention of the Synod of Kells were some enactments against simony and usury, as well as against the prevalence of marriage and concubinage among the clergy."—See O'Donovan's *Four Masters*, ii. 1101, *note*.

[2] See Keating, as quoted in King's *Memoir*, p. 104.

[3] See King's *Memoir*, p. 104.

was not effected without difficulty.[1] Judging from the analogy of councils held elsewhere in the West about this period, we may infer that some of these synods were not free assemblies, in which every member was at liberty to introduce subjects for consideration ; but rather courts in which only such measures as had the sanction of the representative of the Pope were propounded and discussed. Hence their decisions were very partially obeyed. The enactments of the Synod of Rathbreasail were so little observed that, forty-two years afterwards, it was found necessary at the Synod of Kells to re-enact them with some modifications ; and the regulations of Kells were in like manner neglected ; so that, sixty-four years afterwards, they had not been carried into execution.[2] But, in the meantime, events occurred which opened up quite a new scene in the history of the country, and served greatly to promote the progress of the ecclesiastical revolution already inaugurated.

Ever since the Norman conquest the English kings had been looking wistfully across the Channel ; and some of them are said to have openly expressed a desire to add Ireland to their territories.[3] But, until the beginning of the reign of Henry II., no decisive steps were taken with a view to its annexation. Shortly after his accession to the throne, that able and unscrupulous sovereign despatched his chaplain, John of Salisbury, to Rome, to obtain the sanction of the Pope to a scheme for its subjugation. The time was most favourable for the application ; as Nicholas Breakspear—who

---

[1] The power of the chief monarchs of the island appears to have been exerted to the uttermost to bring about the change. Thus, in an ancient antiphonarium formerly belonging to the Cathedral Church of Armagh, but preserved in Ussher's collection of MSS. in Trinity College, Dublin, the following entry appears :— "A.D. MCLXX. A prayer for Donnchadh O'Carrol, supreme King of Argiall. . . . By him the Church throughout the land of Oirghiall was *reformed*, and a *regular bishopric was made*, and *the Church was placed under the jurisdiction of a bishop*."— PETRIE'S *Eccles. Archit. of Ireland*, p. 394.

[2] It appears from Constitutions made in A.D. 1216 by Simon Rochfort, bishop of Meath, that until then, inasfar as Meath was concerned, the regulations of the Synod of Kells had remained almost, if not altogether, a dead letter. See these Constitutions as given by Wilkins in his *Concilia*, i. 547.

[3] See *Pictorial Hist. of England*, i. 460 ; and Moore's *Hist. of Ireland*, ii. 206.

had just then been promoted to the pontifical dignity, under the title of Adrian IV.—was an Englishman by birth, and extremely desirous to gratify the wishes of the young British monarch. No political pretext could be assigned for the invasion; for the two countries had long been on terms of friendly intercourse: but the Pope readily discovered a reason for the conquest of Ireland. It cannot be pleaded that he was ignorant of the state of the nation; for he had spent many years in the neighbouring island, and he had received his education from an Irishman, named Marianus Scotus.[1] He had, besides, better and more recent opportunities of obtaining information. The Life of Malachy O'Morgair, by Bernard, the most influential ecclesiastic of his age, had already appeared;[2] and had, no doubt, found its way to Rome. Cardinal Paparo had very lately returned from Ireland—where he had spent nearly half a year among the clergy and laity all over the kingdom. Through these channels Adrian must have been furnished with an accurate account of its ecclesiastical condition. The testimony of a Pontiff so well supplied with materials to guide his judgment cannot be perused without interest. If any fresh evidence were required to prove that the Synods of Rathbreasail and Kells had failed to Romanize Ireland, it is here forthcoming. The Isle of Saints is described as lying partly in the empire of the Prince of Darkness. The land which, not many centuries before, had shed the light of its literature over Europe, is represented as almost beyond the pale of civilization. Henry must enter it to subdue it for the Catholic Church,[3] to root out its "nurseries of vice," and to compel it to pay the annual pension of a penny for each house to the heir of St. Peter. This Bull, drawn up in the plenitude of apostolical authority, is one of the curiosities of history:[4]—

---

[1] See before, p. 159, *note* (3).

[2] Bernard died aged 63 in A.D. 1153. His *Life of Malachy* appeared about two years before, or in A.D. 1151.

[3] Hence Matthew Paris says:—"Henricus . . . . rogavit papam Adrianum, ut sibi liceret, ... homines illos bestiales ad fidem et viam reducere veritatis et *obedientiam ecclesiae Romanae.*"—*Historia Anglorum*, vol. i. p. 304.

[4] The Bull may be found in the original Latin in *Cambrensis Eversus*, edited by

"Adrian, Bishop, servant of the servants of God, to his dearest son in Christ, the illustrious King of England, greeting, and apostolic benediction.

"Full laudably and profitably has your Magnificence conceived the design of propagating your glorious renown on earth, and of completing your reward of eternal happiness in heaven, whilst, as a Catholic Prince, you are intent on *enlarging the borders of the Church*, teaching the truth of the Christian faith to the ignorant and rude, *extirpating the nurseries of iniquity from the field of the Lord*, and for the more convenient execution of this purpose, requiring the counsel and favour of the Apostolic See. In which the maturer your deliberation and the greater the discretion of your procedure, by so much the happier, we trust, will be your progress, with the assistance of the Lord; because whatever has its origin in ardent faith and in love of religion always has a prosperous end and issue.

"There is indeed no doubt but that Ireland and all the islands on which Christ the Sun of Righteousness has shone, and which have received the doctrines of the Christian faith, belong to the jurisdiction of St. Peter, and of the holy Roman Church, as your Excellency also acknowledges. And therefore we are the more solicitous to propagate a faithful plantation among them, and a seed pleasing to the Lord, as we have the secret conviction of conscience that a very rigorous account must be rendered of them.

"You then, most dear son in Christ, have signified to us your desire to enter into the island of Ireland *that you may reduce the people to obedience to laws, and extirpate the nurseries of vice;* and that you are willing to pay from each house a

---

Kelly, ii. 410-14. See also Ussher's *Sylloge.* Epist. xlvi. Works by Elrington, iv. 546-7; *Giraldus Cambrensis de Rebus a se gestis*, lib. ii. c. xi; and Matthew Paris, *Historia Anglorum*, vol. i. p. 304. London, 1866. Before the seventeenth century even Roman Catholic writers never ventured to question the genuineness of this Bull. In the early part of that century David Rothe, afterwards Roman Catholic bishop of Ossory, quotes it as a document of undoubted authority. See his *Analecta*, pp. 155, 189. Coloniae, 1617. Stanihurst does not doubt its claims (*De Rebus in Hibernia Gestis*, lib. iii. p. 155. Antwerp, 1584); and Philip O'Sullivan (*Hist. Cath. Iberniae Compendium*, tom. ii., lib. i., c. 4) gives it at length as a genuine document.

yearly pension of one penny to St. Peter,[1] and that you will preserve the rights of the churches of this land whole and inviolate. We, therefore, with that grace and acceptance suited to your pious and laudable design, and favourably assenting to your petition, hold it good and acceptable that, *for extending the borders of the Church,* restraining the progress of vice, for the correction of manners, the planting of virtue, and the increase of the Christian religion, you enter that island, and execute therein whatever shall pertain to the honour of God and welfare of the land ; and that the people of that land receive you honourably, and reverence you as their lord,—the rights of their churches still remaining sacred and inviolate, and saving to St. Peter the annual pension of one penny from every house.

"If then you are resolved to carry the design you have conceived into effectual execution, study to form that nation to virtuous manners; and labour by yourself and others whom you shall judge meet for this work, in faith, word, and life, that the Church may be there adorned, that *the religion of the Christian faith may be planted and grow up,* and that all things pertaining to the honour of God and the salvation of souls be so ordered, that you may be entitled to the fulness of eternal reward in God, and obtain a glorious renown on earth throughout all ages."

No wonder that Roman Catholic authors are ashamed of this document. No wonder that some of them have laboured, with all their ingenuity, to prove it spurious. "This Bull," says one, "*must be a forgery* of some unknown impostor, and not the decree of Adrian. He was raised to the purple by Eugene III., and was a colleague in that great dignity with Eugene's legate, John Paparo, a man of the strictest integrity, and praised in the highest terms by St. Bernard in his epistles. Adrian could have easily ascertained that, during the legatine mission of his colleague Paparo, all the disorders of Ireland had been rectified. . . . The concoctor of this Bull, therefore, merits the most hearty execration for representing the

[1] In the twelfth century a penny was equal in value to at least two shillings and six pence of our present currency. According to some it was worth from four to five shillings. See *Malone,* p. 36, *note.*

character of the Pope in so odious a light. He represents him, in the first place, as having no title to be called an honest man; next, as a man who was swayed by his own interests, not by justice; then, as condemning the innocent without a hearing; again, as subverting the kingdom of Ireland, which had never before owned any foreign power; moreover, as the credulous dupe of whispering slanderers, the violator of the rights of immemorial possession; the enemy of all laws; the most profligate scoffer at all religion; finally, the firebrand of execrable war, and the most odious propagator of burning hatred."[1]

Such is the impassioned language employed by an able and honest Roman Catholic writer, after having quoted at length the famous letter which gave Henry permission to invade Ireland. The Pope unquestionably deserved all the hard epithets here applied to him; for, in all the records of human degeneracy, we could not readily point to many other documents so replete with hypocrisy and villany.[2] Henry was a most licentious prince; his character was notorious; and, to give such a man a commission to take possession of Ireland under the pretext that he would improve the morals of the people, was as wicked as it was preposterous. Though a few writers — determined to close their eyes against all evidence—have insisted that the Bull must be a fabrication, the highest and most competent authorities connected with the Church of Rome have been constrained to acknowledge

---

[1] *Cambrensis Eversus*, edited by Kelly, ii. 431, 443. This work was published originally in 1662. The author, the Rev. Dr. Lynch, R.C. archdeacon of Tuam, writes under the assumed name of *Gratianus Lucius*. The late Rev. Dr. Kelly, who edited the work printed for the Celtic Society in 1848 with a translation and notes, was a professor of Maynooth College.

[2] A recent Roman Catholic historian, who acknowledges the genuineness of the Bull, declares that the Pope came to an unseasonable end because he issued it. "Adrian IV.," says he, "who authorized the invasion of Henry II., *was choked!*" Malone's *Church History of Ireland*, p. 100. Dublin, 1863. Adrian died of quinsy; but a report prevailed that after he had excommunicated, as was alleged, the Emperor Frederic, a fly got into his throat, as he was drinking at a fountain, and that he was in this way suffocated. See Bower's *History of the Popes*, Hadrian IV. Matthew Paris hints that he was poisoned. See his *Works*, vol. iii. p. 194. London, 1869.

it as the veritable production of Adrian IV. There is, in fact, no memorial in all antiquity better authenticated. It is here quite unnecessary to multiply attestations to be found in Protestant writers; for the proofs of its genuineness adduced by the Roman Catholic Dr. Lanigan, are abundantly sufficient. "Adrian's Bull," says he, "is of so unwarrantable and unjustifiable a nature, that some writers could not bring themselves to believe that he issued it, and have endeavoured to prove it a forgery; but their efforts were of no avail, and *never did there exist a more real or authentic document.*"[1]

---

[1] *Ecc. Hist. of Ireland*, iv. 164. Lanigan adds in a note to the passage quoted in the text:—"Gratianus Lucius (Lynch) greatly exerted himself (*Camb. Evers.* c. 22) in striving to show that the Bull is spurious, and Mac-Geoghegan [in his *History of Ireland*] would fain make us believe the same thing. It has not indeed been published in the *Bullarium Romanum*, the editors of which *were ashamed of it.* But there was a copy of it in the Vatican Library, as is clear from its being referred to by Pope John XXII., in his Brief to Edward II. of England, written in 1319, which Brief is in the *Bullarium*, and may be seen in Wilkins' *Councils*, vol. ii., p. 491; in Brodin's *Descriptio regni Hiberniae*, printed at Rome in 1721; and in Mac-Geoghegan's *Histoire &c.*, tom. 2, p. 116. In said Brief the Pope not only refers to Adrian's Bull or letter by name, but says that he joins to the brief a copy of it for the use of the king. And Baronius, who has published the Bull in his *Annales &c.*, at A.D. 1159 (not because he thought it was issued in that year) tells us, that he took his copy of it from a *Codex Vaticanus.* Then we have the testimony of the very intriguer employed in procuring this Bull, John of Salisbury, who . . . . has "ad preces meas illustri regi Anglorum Henrico II. concessit (Adrianus) et dedit Hiberniam jure haereditario possidendam, *sicut literae ipsius testantur in hodiernum diem.* Nam omnes insulae de jure antiquo, ex donatione Constantini qui eam fundavit et dotavit, dicuntur ad Romanam ecclesiam pertinere. Annulum quoque," &c. Lynch having seen this passage, thought that it was supposed to be taken from the *Polycraticus* of John of Salisbury, and then argues that it is not in the genuine *Polycraticus.* But he ought to have known that it was quoted, not from the *Polycraticus*, but from another of John's works, entitled *Metalogicus.* Adrian's grant of Ireland to Henry is expressly mentioned and confirmed by Pope Alexander III. in his letter to him of the year 1172. Giraldus Cambrensis (*De Reb. a se gest.*, part ii. c. 11., and *Hib. Expug.* l. ii., c. 6), Matthew Paris (*Hist. Maj. &c.* at A.D. 1155), and others give not only an account of said Bull, but the Bull itself: and Ussher states (*Sylloge*, *note* on No. 46) that he saw copies of it in the registers of the dioceses of Dublin and Lismore. What has now been said is surely more than enough to set aside the doubts of Lynch or of any other writer."—Lanigan, *Ecc. Hist.* iv. 165-6. The late Dr. Kelly, of Maynooth, in his notes to the 22nd chap. of *Cambrensis Eversus*, says:—"It has not been considered necessary to adduce in the notes to this chapter any additional proofs of the authenticity of Adrian's letter. Dr. Lanigan, vol. iv., p. 165, and the *Macariae Excidium*, p. 242, *must satisfy the most sceptical on that point.*"—*Camb. Ever.*, by Kelly, ii. 466, *note.*

This Bull was presented to Henry accompanied by a ring, the token of his investiture as sovereign of Ireland.[1] It is noteworthy that, in the document itself, Adrian is very careful to conserve the rights of the Irish churches. But he thus merely intended to prevent the English King, or the Archbishop of Canterbury, from claiming their supervision. He wished that he alone should be recognised as their supreme spiritual ruler. Henry was to aid, with all his power, in the work of ecclesiastical renovation. That he might "enlarge the borders of the Church," he must "extirpate" what are called "the nurseries of iniquity." It is probable that Adrian here contemplated the extinction of the greater number of the old monastic establishments. Their property was required for the support of the new diocesan bishops; and the co-arbs, many of whom claimed a hereditary interest in the revenues, bitterly opposed any change in their appropriation. As the monasteries were seminaries in which the clergy were educated, it was desirable that all institutes, in which the teaching was unfavourable to recent innovations, should be speedily suppressed. Shortly after this period a regulation was adopted in one of the Irish Synods fitted to promote uniformity of instruction in all the theological schools throughout the island. At this meeting, according to the native annals, "the clergy of Ireland determined that no one, who was not an alumnus of Armagh, should be a lector (or theological professor) in any church in Ireland."[2] The instructions given at Armagh, since the time of Malachy, appear to have been strictly in accordance with the principles of Roman Catholicism; and this arrangement was evidently intended to secure the introduction of the same system of doctrine into all the other Hibernian seminaries.

The Bull was drawn up in A.D. 1155—the second year of the reign of Henry,—but the state of public affairs in Great Britain and Normandy prevented him, for a long time after-

[1] John of Salisbury. *Metalogicus*, lib. iv., cap. ult.

[2] *Annals of the Four Masters*, at A.D. 1162. Lanigan seems to think that all the lectors were not selected from those who had studied at Armagh. It was enough, according to his view of the regulation, that they were "approved by the Faculty of Armagh."—*Ecc. Hist.* iv. 180.

wards, from taking advantage of its provisions. It is not here necessary to relate the circumstances of the invasion of Ireland by Strongbow and his companions. We may simply state that in A.D. 1171 Henry himself arrived at Waterford,[1] and proceeded to take possession of a kingdom which has ever since remained subject to the English sceptre. Surrounded by a strong military force, he encountered scarcely a shadow of opposition.[2] Resistance seemed hopeless; and one petty prince after another appeared before him to do him homage.

As might have been expected, the announcement of the arrival of the first body of invaders created a great sensation all over Ireland; but, instead of stimulating the martial ardour of the native population, it seems to have produced a feeling of deep and general despondency. "The clergy of the whole of Ireland being convened at Armagh," says a contemporary writer, "and the subject of the arrival of the strangers in the island having been long talked over and discussed, it was at length adopted, as the common sentiment of all, that it was on account of the sins of their people, and particularly because in times past they had been in the habit of purchasing persons of English birth, as well from merchants as from robbers and pirates, and of reducing them to slavery, that this calamity had befallen them by the sentence of the Divine judgment; and that they themselves would now in turn be reduced to slavery by the same nation. For the English, whilst their kingdom was yet in a state of security, were accustomed, through a common vice of the nation, to expose their children for sale; and, even before they suffered

---

[1] The place of landing appears to have been Crook, about seven miles from Waterford. See an interesting paper on this subject by the Rev. James Graves, A.B., in the *Journal of the Kilkenny and South-East of Ireland Archæological Society*, vol. i., new series, p. 385.

[2] Hoveden says:—"Venerunt ibidem ad regem Angliae omnes archiepiscopi, episcopi, abbates totius Hiberniae, et receperunt eum in regem et dominum Hiberniae, jurantes ei et haeredibus suis fidelitatem, et regnandi super eos potestatem in perpetuum, et inde dederunt ei cartas suas." *Chronica*, by Stubbs, vol. ii., p. 30. London, 1869. It appears from all contemporary accounts that the prelates were *the first* to welcome Henry II. Hence Hoveden says:—"*Exemplo autem clericorum*, praedicti reges et principes Hyberniæ receperunt *simili modo* Henricum regem Angliae in dominum et regem Hyberniae." *Ibid.*

any poverty or hunger, to sell their own sons and relations to the Irish. . . . It was therefore decreed in the aforesaid council, and publicly enacted with the consent of all the assembly, that in all parts of the island such persons of English birth as were kept in a state of slavery, should be restored to their original liberty."[1]

There is something rather mysterious about the meeting of this Synod at Armagh. It is not noticed by any of the Irish annalists; and the fact that we are indebted for a knowledge of its occurrence to a Welsh writer may fairly generate a suspicion that its proceedings did not awaken much national sympathy. It may be that some of the wiser and more influential of the native princes, alarmed by the aspect of public affairs, had urged the clergy to meet and endeavour to devise some means of aiding them in this grave emergency; but if these ecclesiastical guides acted in the manner just described, they exhibited very little "understanding of the times," and still less faith and patriotism. As we read of their deliberations, we may well take up the impression that false brethren, bought over to the side of England, were permitted to dominate, and to betray the national independence. There is no evidence that the traffic in slaves was carried on to any great extent: and if the Irish who purchased stolen children incurred guilt, surely the English who committed the robbery, or who sold even their own offspring, were not less culpable. Those who supplied the market were at least as

[1] Giraldus Cambrensis, *Hib. Expug.* lib. i., c. 18. About this time slavery properly so called, according to some writers, ceased in Ireland; but villenage remained. The villeins were in a better position than slaves: they were not absolutely at the disposal of their masters: they were bound to the land: but they were obliged to perform only certain specified duties. See Malone, p. 193, *note.* See also Hallam's *Middle Ages*, iii. 175. "In one case," says Hallam, "that of unmolested residence for a year and a day within a walled city or borough, the villein became free."—*Mid. Ages*, iii. 177. "A commission [of Elizabeth] in 1574, directing the enfranchisement of her bondmen and bondwomen on certain manors upon payment of a fine, is the last unequivocal testimony to the existence of villenage" [in England].—*Mid. Ages*, iii. 182-3. There are some traces of the existence of slavery in Ireland in the sixteenth century. See *Journal of the Kilkenny and S.E. of Ireland Arch. Soc.* vol. ii., new series. 1858-59. pp. 340, 341. The villeins were not employed in military service. Warner's *Hist. of Ireland*, vol. i. Introd. p. 98.

wicked as those who bought in it. To infer that Ireland must be brought under the yoke of England because some Irishmen dealt with English men-stealers, was certainly a very lame and impotent conclusion. The invasion of the country might have justly been interpreted as a judgment from heaven; but more general and more weighty reasons for the divine displeasure could have been easily discovered. For sixty or seventy years past the kingdom had been almost uninterruptedly the scene of civil wars; and more churches had meanwhile been burned down than perhaps in any period of the same length during the worst days of the devastations of the Northmen. Ireland for the first time in its history had recently acknowledged the supremacy of the Pope, and had thus parted with its ecclesiastical freedom. Did it not, therefore, deserve to be punished with the loss of its civil liberty? If any such considerations crossed the minds of the members of the Synod of Armagh, they were soon suppressed. Nothing could be more stupid or inglorious than the spirit which pervaded their deliberations. Instead of instructing their countrymen to recognise the threatened invasion as a call to national repentance; and instead of exhorting them to humble themselves before God, to lay aside their shameless contentions, to turn from all their sins, to rise up as one man against the common foe, and to look for help to Him who is very pitiful and of tender mercy, they accepted the conquest of the island as a foregone conclusion, and merely sought to propitiate their future masters by the liberation of such English slaves as were at present in their possession.

Throughout the whole of the transactions connected with the invasion of Ireland, the bishops of the recently erected hierarchy appear in a very equivocal position. As soon as Henry appeared in the country, they did not hesitate to acknowledge his title to its dominion.[1] We may presume that they had been made acquainted with the Bull of Adrian;[2]

---

[1] Matthew Paris, a monk of St. Alban's, who died in A.D. 1259, says:—"Archiepiscopi et episcopi ipsum in regem et dominum *alacriter* susceperunt, et eidem fidelitatem juraverunt."—*Historia Anglorum*, edited by Madden, vol. i., p. 370. London, 1866.

[2] We can scarcely suppose that the Pope's legate for Ireland, who was living

and they could see that their personal interests would be promoted under the new government. A powerful monarch, like the King of England, would be better able to sustain them in their dignities than any of the petty princes they had hitherto obeyed; and as Henry was pledged to enforce the laws of Rome, they had no reason to dread disturbance in the exercise of their enlarged jurisdictions. Early in A.D. 1172 a Synod was assembled at Cashel to take into consideration the state of the Church. Gelasius, the primate of Armagh, was not present; and, as he had now reached his eighty-sixth year, the increasing infirmities of age sufficiently accounted for his non-attendance:[1] but soon afterwards, he visited the court in Dublin, and paid homage to the new Sovereign. The other three archbishops with all their suffragans, as well as some bishops from Ulster, are reported to have joined in the deliberations of this famous convention. Christian of Lismore, the papal legate, presided.

An account of the proceedings of the Synod of Cashel has been handed down to us by Giraldus Cambrensis, or Gerald Barry,—a Welsh ecclesiastic of no little celebrity who flourished at this period. He has preserved a copy of the canons adopted. Among these regulations the following may be mentioned:—

"All the faithful of Christ shall pay *Tithes* of their cattle, corn, and other produce, to the church of their own parish.

---

in the country, was permited to remain ignorant of a matter in which his Church was so much interested. Keating asserts positively that the Irish prelates were made acquainted with the contents of the Bull when it was granted. See also Dr. O'Conor's *Historical Address*, part i., p. 67-8.

[1] It is stated in the *Anna's of the Four Masters*, at A.D. 1173, that on the 27th of March of that year he died in the 87th year of his age. Lanigan asserts that Gelasius was not at Cashel "*because he did not choose to assist at said Synod.*" But of this he has not produced one particle of evidence. Lanigan himself informs us (iv. 218, *note* 24) that "tempestuous weather prevailed" in the spring of A.D. 1172; and, under such circumstances, the old primate could not be expected to go to Cashel, though he may have been able to visit Connaught in the following summer. It is reported of him that he was accustomed to take with him, wherever he went, "a white cow, the milk of which formed his only sustenance."—GIRAL. CAMB. *Expug. Hib.* c. 34. Stanihurst states (*De Reb. in Hib.* iii. 130) that Gelasius was prevented by sickness from attending at Cashel, and adds that *he approved of what his colleagues had done.*

"All church lands and property on them shall be entirely free from the exactions of laymen.

"In the case of homicide committed by the laity, when they compound with their enemies for the offence, the clergy, who are their relatives, shall pay no part of the fine.

"Every head of a family among the faithful, when visited with sickness, shall make a will in the presence of his confessor and neighbours, with becoming solemnity, and divide his movable property into three parts, after deducting debt and servants' wages beforehand:—one part to be for the children; another for the lawful wife; the third to pay the funeral expenses.

"Those who die with a good confession shall be buried with suitable obsequies, and the accompaniment of wakes and masses.

"All offices of divine service shall for the future, in all parts of Ireland, be regulated after the model of the holy Church, according to the observances of the Church of England."[1]

Two other canons relate to marriage and baptism;[2] but, from the enactments quoted, we may form a pretty fair idea of the general tenor of the proceedings of the Synod of Cashel. The importance attached to it may be inferred from the number of bishops who attended[3] in a tempestuous season;

---

[1] An exact copy of these canons may be found in Giraldus Cambrensis, *Hib. Expug*, c. 35. See also Lanigan, iv. 208-9, and Wilkins's *Concilia*, i. 473.

[2] Brompton, the abbot of an English Cistercian monastery, a writer who flourished in the fourteenth century, tells us that at this time some of the wealthy Irish were wont to baptize their children in milk. Lanigan very indignantly rejects this statement; but, withal, it has about it some strong marks of verisimilitude. It is attested, not only by Brompton, but by a still higher authority—Benedict of Peterborough, a contemporary, who says:—"Mos enim prius erat per diversa loca Hiberniae quod statim cum puer nasceretur. . . . si divitis fuerit filius, ter mergeretur in lacte."—*Gest. Hen.* ii. p. 28. Lanigan was ignorant of this testimony.

[3] It appears that the Archbishops of Cashel, Dublin, and Tuam *with all their suffragans* were present. Lanigan, after asserting, without any evidence, that Gelasius of Armagh was unwilling to attend, adds that "no suffragan bishop of Ulster was present;" and yet, immediately afterwards, he is constrained to acknowledge that the bishop of Clogher might have been there. Hoveden, a contemporary, intimates that the bishops of Ulster were present. See his *Chronica*,

and its decrees were obviously calculated to increase the wealth and influence of the clergy. The payment of tithes had been enjoined by the Synod of Kells: but the order seems to have been neglected; and accordingly it is here repeated by an assembly convoked under the authority of the British monarch. By the Synod of Cashel the property of the clergy is exempted from tributes or assessments to which the possessions of the laity are liable; and the parish priests are provided with a revenue from masses, wakes, and funerals. The sanction of the Sovereign gave effect to these regulations. The worship of the Church of Ireland is henceforth to be conformed to that of the Church of England; and from this period till the Reformation popery maintained an almost undisputed ascendency in the Western Isle.

What a change passed over the Church and State of Ireland between the days of Patrick, Columbkille, and Columbanus, and the time of the Synod of Cashel! Then, the saints of the country practised only "such works of piety and chastity as they could learn from the prophetical, evangelical, and apostolical writings;"[1] now, these prophetical, evangelical, and apostolical writings were seldom mentioned. Then, it was believed that the soul, after death, entered at once into a state of permanent happiness or misery; now, the doctrine of purgatory was acknowledged, and the priests derived no inconsiderable portion of their income from masses for the dead. Then, the presbyter Columbkille ordained a king, as well as bishops; now no presbyter was permitted to ordain even a deacon. Then, Mary was never named as an intercessor in heaven; now, she was invoked by many perhaps more frequently than the Lord of Glory. Then, the Irish were unwilling to eat at the same table with Romanists, and spurned all badges of papal subserviency; now, a well-meaning but deluded Irish-

---

vol. ii., p. 31. London, 1869. Benedict of Peterborough, another contemporary, bears the same testimony. *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi*, p. 29. London, 1867. We may fairly draw the same conclusion from the language of Giraldus Cambrensis: "Rex. . . . *totius cleri Hiberniae*, concilium apud Cassiliam convocavit."—*Expug. Hiber.* lib. i., cap. 34.

[1] Bede, iii. 4.

man had recently travelled all the way to Rome, that he might there obtain symbols of slavery for the Church of his fathers. Then, Ireland was free, and honoured as the land of saints and of scholars; now, she was under the yoke of the stranger, and represented as a land of darkness and of the shadow of death!

CHAPTER II.

FROM THE SYNOD OF CASHEL TO THE DEATH OF KING JOHN. A.D. 1172 TO A.D. 1216.[1]

THOUGH the Bull of Adrian, conveying a new kingdom to Henry II., was obtained in the beginning of his reign, several modern writers have asserted that, for twenty years afterwards, neither the clergy nor people of Ireland were aware of its existence.[2] This statement is as unsupported by evidence as it is destitute of probability. A bull is an official deed, attested with all due formality; and no proof whatever can be given that any special secresy was observed in reference to this memorial. It was well known to the English nobility; for, when it was procured, Henry, in a meeting held at Winchester, discussed with them the expediency of an immediate invasion;[3] but, after mature deliberation, they arrived at the conclusion that, in the present state of his affairs, he was not in a position to attempt the undertaking. A papal legate was now constantly resident in the island; he kept up a correspondence with Rome; and it is not to be supposed that a project, which his Italian master had determined to promote, was kept concealed from such a functionary. The Popes at this period had reached the very meridian of their power: they claimed temporal as well as spiritual dominion

[1] Henry II. A.D. 1172 to A.D. 1189; Richard I. A.D. 1189 to A.D. 1199; John, A.D. 1199 to A.D. 1216.

[2] See, for example, Lanigan iv. 164, 222; and Haverty's *History of Ireland*, p. 205.

[3] See Ussher's *Sylloge*. Epist. xlvi. *Recensio*, Works, iv. p. 548. The ring of investiture, as lord of Ireland, which Henry received from the Pope, was publicly exhibited—"Idemque adhuc annulus in curiali archio publico custodiri jussus est."—*Ibid.*

over countries such as Ireland; and, on the principles promulgated by Hildebrand, and avowed by his successors, Adrian would have defended his donation to King Henry, as a perfectly legitimate exercise of his pontifical prerogative. It has been asserted, and not without evidence, that the Irish prelates at the time were informed of the transaction; and that it met with their approval.[1] There are good grounds for believing that even the Irish princes soon heard of the papal document. Dermod McMurrough—the deposed King of Leinster, who has ever since been consigned to infamous notoriety as the betrayer of the national independence—was apparently apprized of the contents of the Bull when he entered on his inglorious career. This worthless prince was a great favourite with the clergy, for he had loaded them with benefactions; and, when he sought to recover his throne, he pursued a course which no Irish monarch in like circumstances had ever before ventured to adopt, but which a knowledge of the Roman diploma would have obviously suggested. He sought out the King of England; threw himself at his feet; implored his protection; and, in the event of his successful interference, promised, on behalf of himself and his heirs, to acknowledge Henry as his liege lord, and to hold his territories as the vassal of the British sovereign.[2]

The conduct of the Irish prelates, when Henry made his appearance on their shores, is well fitted to sustain the charge that they were privy to the invasion. Instead of standing aloof, and waiting until compelled by necessity to acknowledge the usurper, they came to him from all parts of the country, and bound themselves to him by an oath of allegiance.[3] Nor did they stop here. According to the testimony

---

[1] See Keating, book ii. 212-3. Dr. O'Conor endorses the statement of Keating with a slight modification. See his *Historical Address*, part i. 67-8. See also Leland, i. 10. Henry was well aware of the power of the clergy; and we may presume that so politic a prince, with the Pope on his side, would at once quietly endeavour to secure their support.

[2] Leland's *History of Ireland*, i. 17-18.

[3] Hoveden *Annal.* A.D. 1171. See before, p. 216, *note* (2). Brompton has the same statement, but he is a somewhat later authority. Hoveden belonged to the household of Henry II., and was subsequently a theological professor at Oxford. We could scarcely desire a better witness.

of trustworthy contemporary writers, Henry received from every archbishop and bishop letters, in form of charters, with their seals pendent, whereby they confirmed the kingdom of Ireland to him and his heirs, and constituted the English monarch and his successors their lords and kings for ever.[1] Copies of these letters were in due time transmitted to Rome, and were received most graciously by the Sovereign Pontiff.

Certain writers are exceedingly unwilling to admit that the Irish prelates espoused the cause of Henry so promptly and decidedly at the time of the English invasion. But the course which they pursued is attested by contemporary authors of high respectability, whose statements are clear and circumstantial, and who had the best means of information.[2] According to these witnesses, the bishops took the lead in submitting to the new ruler, whilst the princes and chieftains *followed* their example. Nor is it strange that the king received such a ready recognition from the hierarchy. The prelates were deeply pledged to obey the Pope; and they regarded him as empowered to set up and depose sovereigns. They were,

[1] "Et inde recepit ab unoquoque archiepiscopo et episcopo litteras suas in modum cartae extra sigillum pendentes, et confirmantes ei et haeredibus suum regnum Hiberniae, et testimonium perhibentes ipsos eum et haeredes suos sibi in reges et dominos constituisse in perpetuum."—BENEDICT OF PETERBOROUGH, *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi*, p. 26. London, 1867. The Irish writers are silent as to this affair. Though Cambrensis does not mention it, he makes other statements which quite accord with it. The testimony of Benedict is confirmed by Hoveden, *Chronica*, ii. p. 30. London, 1860. Matthew Paris, writing some time afterwards, bears exactly the same testimony. See his *Historia Anglorum*, vol. i., p. 370. London, 1866. Irish writers suppress these facts evidently because they were ashamed of them.

[2] In the *Chronicle of Benedict of Peterborough*, described by Mr. Stubbs, regius professor of modern history in the University of Oxford, as "indisputably the most important chronicle of the time," (Preface, p. 57) the writer gives the names of four Irish archbishops and twenty-nine bishops who swore fealty to Henry II. on his arrival in Ireland. *Gest. Reg. Hen. Sec. Bened. Abbat.*, 26-37. Henry had sent trusty agents before him into Ireland to announce his coming; and thus it was that the prelates so soon waited on him. Dr. Doyle, who was well acquainted with Irish history, did not hesitate to assert that the Irish prelates sold their country to Henry II. "Tithes," said the Roman Catholic bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, "*were the price paid by Henry II. and the Legate Paparo to the Irish prelates*, who sold for them the independence of their native land, and the birthright of their people."—*Vindication of the Irish Catholics*, by J. K. L. Second edition, p. 33. Dublin, 1823.

therefore, bound, in consistency, to bow to his dictation; and to give a cordial greeting to the new master of his appointment. Nor were they altogether disinterested in the transference of their loyalty. They hoped under the great King of England to have wealth, rank, and influence, such as they could not have otherwise enjoyed.

The canons of the Synod of Cashel were duly forwarded to Rome,[1] accompanied by a letter from the assembled prelates. Alexander III., the reigning Pontiff, was highly gratified when he heard of Henry's successful progress; and accordingly, in September 1172, dictated no less than three epistles relating to Ireland—one addressed to its kings, princes, and nobles—another, to Henry II.—and a third, to the hierarchy. These letters, which are still extant,[2] throw considerable light on the ecclesiastical state of the country at this crisis. The letter to the kings and chieftains is but brief, and yet sufficiently significant. The Pope tells them how happy he had been to learn that they had wisely submitted to such a potent and magnificent monarch, and exhorts them to adhere faithfully to their oaths of allegiance. In his epistle to the English sovereign, he urges him to persevere in his endeavours for the enlargement of the Church of Rome. "Your Excellency is aware," he says, "that the Roman Church has by right an authority over islands different from what she possesses over the mainland and continent. Having, therefore, such a confident hope in the fervour of your devotion as to believe it would be your desire, not only to conserve, but also to extend the privileges of the said Church, and to establish her jurisdiction, as you are in duty bound, *where she has none*, we ask and earnestly urge your Highness to study diligently to preserve to us in the aforesaid land the rights of St. Peter; and if the said Church *have no such jurisdiction there*, that your Highness should assign and appoint it to her."[3] These

[1] Lanigan, iv. 217.

[2] In the new edition of Rymer's *Foedera*, vol. i. 45. They may also be found in the supplementary volume of King's *Primer*, pp. 1085-1091, and in the *Liber Munerum Publicorum Hiberniae*, part iv. p. 54.

[3] "Et quia sicut tuae magnitudinis Excellentia [recognoscit], Romana ecclesia aliud jus habet in insulâ quam in terrâ magnâ et continuâ, nos eam de tuae devotionis fervore spem fiduciamque tenentes, quod jura ipsius ecclesiae non solum

words involve a confession, on the part of the Pope, that his authority was even yet very partially recognized in the Isle of Saints.

The letter to the hierarchy is written in the same strain. Its great object is to inculcate obedience to Henry as the best friend of the Roman Church. He tells them that, should any of the princes or people of the country attempt to act in opposition to the oath of fealty they had taken, they must in the first instance be admonished; and then, if found incorrigible, excommunicated. At the close, he enforces his exhortation by an argument which they could all well understand. "Be sure," says he, "that you execute our commands with diligence and earnestness, that as the aforesaid king, like a good catholic and truly Christian prince, is stated to have paid to us a pious and benign attention *in restoring you as well the tithes as the other ecclesiastical dues*, so you likewise may yourselves firmly maintain, and as far as in you lies, see to it that others maintain, whatever privileges appertain to the king's dignity."

In his anxiety to establish the English power in Ireland, this Pope did not stop here. He issued a Brief[1] confirmatory of the Bull of Adrian, in which he expressed an expectation that "the barbarous nation" would attain, under the government of Henry, "to some decency of manners;" and that when its Church, "hitherto in a disordered state," was better regulated, the people would "possess the reality as well as the name of the Christian profession." In A.D. 1175 this Brief reached Ireland; and, with the Bull of Adrian appended to it, was published in that year, with all due solemnity, in a Synod held at Waterford.[2]

---

conservare velis, *sed etiamam pliare, et ubi nullum jus habet*, id debes sibi conferre: Magnificentiam Tuam rogamus et sollicitè commonemus, ut in praescripta terra jura beati Petri nobis studeas sollicitè conservare, *et si etiam ibi non habet*, Tua Magnitudo eidem ecclesiae eadem jura constituat et assignet."—RYMER'S *Foedera Edit.* London, 1816. Vol. i., part i., p. 45.

[1] This brief is No. 47 in Ussher's *Sylloge.* It may be found in Giraldus Cambrensis, *Expug. Hibernica*, lib. ii., cap. v., pp. 318-9. London, 1867. See also Benedict of Peterborough's *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi*, p. 28. London, 1867.

[2] Ware's *Annals* at A.D. 1175. Giraldus Cambrensis, lib. ii., cap. v., *Expug. Hibr.* p. 316.

The Bull of Adrian is a most transparent specimen of unctuous effrontery; and the letters just quoted are written in the same style of sanctimonious profession. Alexander III. must have had strange ideas of piety if he regarded Henry II. as "a truly Christian prince," and if he really had any confidence in "the fervour of his devotion." The whole of this papal correspondence richly deserves the criticism embodied in the words of the apostle—"speaking lies in hypocrisy."[1] And at this crisis the Irish bishops occupy a most unenviable position. We may hesitate to believe that they very actively promoted the invasion of their country; but facts already stated abundantly prove that they most readily submitted to the usurper. In obedience to his summons, they met in conclave at Cashel, where his own chaplain and certain other British churchmen appeared to announce his will; and where all the Synodical arrangements were such as secured his approbation.[2] Though, under the new dynasty, they anticipated a splendid addition to their honours and emoluments, we cannot believe that they contemplated passing events without some misgivings. They must have felt that they were in the hands of a stranger, and that the prestige of their country was gone. Could they have foreseen the indignities which awaited the children of the Irish church, they might well have been sorrowful and ashamed.

Had the country been now thoroughly subdued, and had the supremacy of English law been firmly and universally established, Ireland would have escaped much of the misery under which it groaned during ages of anarchy and misgovernment. But it was like a man badly wounded by an enemy, and then left to linger out a wretched existence. Whilst the dominion of the conqueror was asserted in the leading towns along the eastern and southern coast, and in some adjacent

[1] I. Tim. iv. 2.

[2] "Concilii autem statuta subscripta sunt, et regiae sublimitatis authoritate firmata." Giraldus Cambrensis, *Expug. Hib.* i. xxxv. It is stated in the *Book of Howth* that the clergy assembled at Cashel "plainly determined the conquest to be lawful, and threatened all people under pain of holy Church's indignation, to accept the English kings for their lords from time to time."—*Calendar of Carew MSS.* p. 224. London, 1871.

districts, the greater portion of the island remained subject to the native princes. These petty dynasts acted as they pleased, and yielded a merely nominal submission to the British sceptre. They were guided by the Brehon law—an old Irish code of regulations framed in times of very imperfect civilization.[1] Even murder, according to its provisions, had no higher punishment assigned to it than a fine, or *eric*, estimated according to the rank of the individual assassinated. The Irish kings, in their several territories, exercised all the rights of sovereignty,—such as the appointment of judges, the exaction of tribute, the proclamation of war, and the arrangement of treaties of peace. The enactments of the English statute book regulated the decisions of the judges within the comparatively narrow limits of what was eventually called *the Pale*;[2] the Brehon law prevailed elsewhere. The borders of the English territory were often ill-defined,—so that the inhabitants of some districts could not well tell to what authority they were amenable. No wonder that confusion reigned when such was the state of the country.

When the Irish prelates submitted so cordially to Henry, and prepared, in obedience to the papal mandate, to excommunicate all who opposed his government, they must have wilfully closed their eyes against the utter want of principle which marked his entire policy. His military vassals had been permitted with impunity to league themselves with a dethroned tyrant—the ex-king of Leinster—to attack an

[1] Three volumes of the Brehon law, entitled *Senchus Mor*, have already appeared under the direction of the Commissioners for publishing the ancient laws and institutes of Ireland. Dublin and London, 1865, 1869, and 1873.

[2] The word *Pale* was not used until long after the time of Henry II. The words *March* and *Border* are of greater antiquity. See Hardiman's *Introd. to the Statute of Kilkenny*, p. xxvi. *Irish Arch. Soc. Public Tracts relating to Ireland*, vol. ii. What was afterwards called the English Pale was also known as "the land of Ireland." See Leland, i. 244. About the close of the fifteenth century, the four counties of Dublin, Kildare, Meath, and Louth—or the part of them to which the English territory was then limited—were surrounded by a dyke and raised fence, and thus acquired the name of "the English Pale."—GILBERT'S *Viceroys*, p. 459. Richey's *Lectures*, p. 212. It is said that in the reign of King John, twelve counties were formed in Ireland, viz. :—Dublin, Meath, Kildare, Orgial, Carlow, Kilkenny, Wexford, Waterford, Cork, Kerry, Limerick, and Tipperary. Orgial was what is now called Louth.

unoffending people, to take possession of their towns, to seize their property, and to spread desolation all around. He himself, at the head of an army, and under pretence of a commission from the Pope, had appeared in the island to terrify it into submission. The conduct of its invaders showed, every day more and more clearly, how ill-qualified they were to promote either its moral or material improvement. Their great object was to enrich themselves at the expense of the natives; and, in seeking to advance their interests, they respected no rights whether sacred or secular. The proceedings of Strongbow—the most prominent figure among the early military adventurers—called forth the general execration of the Irish people. About four years after the council of Cashel he closed his earthly course; the disease which brought him to the grave is said to have been of a loathsome character; and the public voice pronounced it to be a divine visitation on the reckless spoiler. The Irish annals tell us that it was inflicted by the saints whose churches he had desolated; and that he had proved the greatest scourge to the native laity and clergy that had appeared among them since the days of the savage Turgesius.[1]

Earl Strongbow was succeeded as chief governor of Ireland by William Fitz Aldelm,[2] an English nobleman of distinguished birth. The new viceroy was accompanied into this country by John De Courcy,—a military commander fitted by his daring spirit and extraordinary bodily strength for the most desperate enterprises. The king, as is alleged, had given to this rough soldier a grant of the whole province of Ulster, on condition that he would effect its subjugation. Though a treaty more recently made with Roderic O'Conor, the chief of the native princes, now stood in the way of the arrangement, De Courcy was by no means prepared to resign his claim to the splendid prize held out to him as the reward

[1] See O'Donovan's *Annals of the Four Masters*, at A.D. 1176, vol. iii., 25, 26, *note.*

[2] He is sometimes called Fitz-Audeline. Cambrensis calls him *Aldelini filius. Expug.* ii. c. 15. He was the ancestor of the powerful family of De Burgo and the Earls of Clanricarde. Hardiman's *Galway*, p. 44, *note.* In A.D. 1179 he obtained a grant of the entire province of Connaught. *Ibid.* p. 45.

of successful warfare. In opposition to the will of the chief governor, he gathered around him a band of knights as hardy and adventurous as himself; marched northwards; suddenly made his appearance in Downpatrick one morning at break of day, pillaged the town, and slaughtered many of the inhabitants. Dunlevy, the prince of the district, fled from his capital in consternation, and sought the interference of Cardinal Vivian, a papal legate who had just arrived in that part of Ireland. Vivian—probably aware that De Courcy was acting without the sanction of the viceroy[1]—professed to be dissatisfied; and even encouraged the natives to rise up in resistance; but, as he knew well that the king of England would not be displeased should the enterprise succeed, he took care not to contribute to its failure by hurling a sentence of excommunication against the unprincipled aggressor.[2] De Courcy paid little attention to a mediator who remonstrated so feebly; and, though the natives gave him most vigorous opposition, he continued to prosecute the war in Ulster.

Cardinal Vivian proceeded soon afterwards to Dublin, where he convened a Synod[3] in which the great topic brought before the attention of the assembly was the duty of obedience to the king of England. As the natives still submitted most reluctantly to the yoke recently imposed on them, the legate had been sent into the country to endeavour to reduce them to obedience by the pressure of pontifical authority, "He had a commission," says an ancient annalist, "to denounce as excommunicated and accursed all that would resist the soldiers and ministers of their lord the king."[4] The Irish soon discovered that, whilst professing great zeal for the interests of the British monarch, he could not conceal his anxiety to

---

[1] Vivian, it appears, had just arrived from the Isle of Man when De Courcy reached Downpatrick. See *Chronicle of Benedict of Peterborough*, p. 137. De Courcy had, shortly before, married the daughter of the King of Man.

[2] According to Hoveden, Vivian was taken prisoner by the troops of De Courcy, but was set at liberty as soon as the English knight was aware of his captivity. The Bishop of Down, who was subsequently captured, was set free at the earnest request of the Cardinal. Hoveden, ii. p. 120.

[3] In A.D. 1177.

[4] Dowling's Annals as quoted in King's *Memoirs*, p. 110. Girald. Cambrens. *Expugnatio Hibernica*, lib. ii., c. 19.

obtain pecuniary contributions for his own benefit. All accounts concur in representing him as exceedingly covetous.[1] His cupidity and insolence speedily brought him into collision even with the English officials; and, after a brief sojourn, he was obliged to leave the island. "When," says a contemporary writer,[2] "he showed a disposition to carry on his proceedings rather too freely after the Roman style, in the churches of a people of barbarous simplicity, the king's officers giving him to understand that he must either go his way, or else fight with them, he returned to Scotland, having secured but little Irish gold,—a commodity, for which he had been sorely thirsting."[3]

It would appear that none save churchmen were admitted to the Dublin council over which this papal legate presided. In former times laymen formed a portion of the members of Irish ecclesiastical conventions; but the prevalence of Romish principles issued in the curtailment of their privileges; and, shortly before this period, they began to be excluded from the national Synods.[4] The establishment of the English power in the country contributed still farther to change the constitution of the Church. Bishops had previously been chosen by the joint suffrages of the clergy and people;[5] but Henry II., as sovereign of the island, now claimed the right of appointment. About A.D. 1175 we find him nominating an Irishman, named Augustin, to the bishopric of Waterford; and

---

[1] Even Baronius describes his legateship as "scandalised by his infamous greed of gold." *Annal*, ad An. 1183.

[2] William of Newbridge.

[3] King's *Memoir*, p. 110.

[4] At a former period we read of Synods of the clergy and *laity* of Ireland. See *Annals of the Four Masters*, A.D. 1111, 1157, and 1167. About this time the laity disappear from these conventions. The meeting held by Vivian is described in the *Annals* as "a Synod of the *clergy* of Ireland, both bishops and abbots." King has remarked that the laity were excluded "for the first time" at the Synod of Cashel. *Primer of the Church History of Ireland*, ii. 531. Dublin, 1846. The parish priests also ceased now to sit with the bishops. "There is yet extant," says Dr. Charles O'Conor, "a MS. copy of Irish canons written before the eighth century . . . . in which this right of the second order of Irish clergy to attend in Synods manifestly appears." *Columbanus ad Hibernos*, No. 2, pp. 68-69.

[5] The abbots, in like manner, are said to have been anciently elected by the clergy and people. See Lanigan, iv. 178.

directing him to be consecrated by the archbishop of Cashel.[1] Soon afterwards the Irish Church was subject to deeper humiliation; for her places of highest dignity were conferred on Englishmen. The Pope, in a short time, endeavoured to secure a share of the patronage; and thus, in after ages, even Italians contrived occasionally to possess themselves of Irish bishoprics.

In A.D. 1179 no less than six Irish prelates appeared in a general council of what was called the Catholic Church. In that year O'Toole, archbishop of Dublin; O'Duffy, archbishop of Tuam; O'Brien, bishop of Killaloe; Felix, bishop of Lismore; Augustin, bishop of Waterford; and Brictius, bishop of Limerick, repaired to Rome, and sat in the third council of Lateran.[2] On this occasion the archbishop of Dublin attracted some attention. Laurence O'Toole was the son of an Irish prince whose territory extended over the southern section of the present county of Kildare;[3] when only five and twenty, he was made abbot of Glendalogh; and in A.D. 1162 —when arrived at more mature years—he was promoted to the Dublin primacy. He lived in eventful times, and occupied a prominent position among the Irish churchmen of the twelfth century. His high rank, his reputed sanctity, his superior talent, and his great energy of character, all contributed to give him extensive influence. His ascetic spirit earned for him the admiration of an age given to superstition. He lived abstemiously, and wore a coarse hair shirt next his skin.[4] But it was obvious that his personal self-denial was not dictated by parsimony. He dispensed generous hospitality to his guests; and delighted to signalize

[1] Benedict of Peterborough, pp. 103-4.

[2] Lanigan, iv. 238. This is commonly called the Eleventh Œcumenical Council. It ordained that the Pope must henceforth be elected by the votes of two-thirds of the Cardinals.

[3] O'Donovan's *Four Masters*, iii. 53, *note.*

[4] According to the traditional accounts, this shirt, "reaching down from his neck to his heels, was everywhere sewed close to his limbs, and *never put off, never washed, never changed*, never opened while the pieces of it could hold together,—only one certain piece that was turned aside thrice a day while he received on his bare flesh the smarting strokes of a knotty discipline." *Prospect of the State of Ireland*, p. 293, by P. W. (Peter Walsh) 1682.

his charity by distributing food daily to a crowd of mendicants. He has obtained some credit as a patriot: and on two or three occasions he seems to have sympathised with his oppressed countrymen; but in other cases he acted as a time-server: and he was sadly blinded by his devotion to the interests of the papacy. He appears to have been one of the first of his order who pledged his allegiance to King Henry; he was a member of the Synod of Cashel: and, when Cardinal Vivian at the Dublin council commanded all the men of Ireland to submit to the rule of the English usurper, he was present to sustain the legate by the sanction of his character and influence. When he visited Rome to take part in the proceedings of the third council of Lateran, the reigning Pontiff exhibited an anxiety to attach him firmly to his interest. He was accordingly appointed legate for all Ireland; and, as a token of peculiar favour, the archbishopric of Dublin was placed under the special care of the Roman See. O'Toole died about a year after his return from Italy—at Eu, on the borders of Normandy, where he had gone to seek an interview with the English sovereign.[1] In A.D. 1226 he was canonized by Pope Honorius III.[2] By many of his countrymen, who are very imperfectly acquainted with his true history, his name is still held in the highest veneration.

Laurence O'Toole was succeeded, as archbishop of Dublin, by John Cumin, or Comyn, an Englishman, selected for the office by Henry II. The appointment of this stranger indicates how soon, under foreign domination, the degradation of the native Church commenced. For nearly five hundred years afterwards, no Irishman was advanced to archiepiscopal rank in the metropolis of Leinster. When Cumin was promoted, he had not yet attained to the priesthood; but his ordination took place soon afterwards; and he was subsequently invested with the archiepiscopal dignity by Pope Lucius III. He was the first Irish prelate consecrated by the Roman Pontiff.[3] He did not arrive in Ireland until three years

[1] He died November 14th, A.D. 1180. Lanigan, iv. 245.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] Rothe in his *Analecta* speaks of him as "presbyter *Cardinalis*," p. 182.

after his election; and when he at length made his appearance in the country, he was the bearer of a papal Bull which added considerably to his ecclesiastical authority. In the Synod of Kells, Armagh was recognised as the Primatial See:[1] but the changes which had meanwhile occurred had suggested both to the Pope and to the King the propriety of a new arrrangement; and, as Dublin was the chief seat of the English power in Ireland, it was deemed expedient to abridge the jurisdiction of the northern metropolitan. The staff of Jesus—a relic to which superstition attached inestimable value—was accordingly transferred, by command of the viceroy, from Armagh to the cathedral of the Irish capital;[2] and the Bull, with which Cumin was now furnished, enacted "that no archbishop or bishop presume to hold meetings in the diocese of Dublin, or to treat of the ecclesiastical causes and affairs of the said diocese, without the consent of its archbishop, if he be in his bishopric, unless such other prelate be enjoined to do so by the Roman Pontiff, or his legate."[3] The Dublin primate was thus, to a very great extent, released from the supervision of any other Irish churchman: but the so-called successors of Patrick stoutly refused to submit to any diminution of their dignity; and, for ages, much scandal was created by the contests for precedence between these two metropolitans.[4]

[1] Gelasius, Primate of Armagh, who died, as already stated, shortly after the Synod of Cashel, was succeeded by Conor Mac Conchailleadh, or Cornelius, who went to Rome and died on his way home in A.D. 1176. In 1854 the Rev. Dr. Dixon, R.C., primate of Armagh, visited Chamberry, near which tradition reports that Conor died, and brought to Ireland what he was told were some of his relics. Dr. Dixon has published a work on this subject entitled *The Blessed Cornelius*. This work proves conclusively that anile superstitions still flourish even among the Irish Roman Catholic hierarchy.

[2] Giraldus Cambrensis's *Topographia Distinctio*, iii., cap. xxxiv.

[3] The whole subject is discussed in MacMahon's *Jus. Primate Armac.* See Lanigan, iv. 260, where an attempt is made partly to explain away the meaning of this bull. See also Brenan *Ecc. Hist.*, p. 251.

[4] In the thirteenth century the Archbishop of Tuam made an unsuccessful attempt to obtain exemption from the supervision of the archbishop of Armagh. About the year 1255 Pope Alexander IV. decided that the Armagh Primate should visit the province of Tuam every five years, and spend not more than twenty-seven days in the visitation. Harris's *Ware*, i. 74. Dublin, 1764. Before this, the Primate was not restricted as to time; but as the people of Tuam were obliged to

Archbishop Cumin was a man of energy and talent. In A.D. 1186 he held a provincial Synod in Dublin in which were adopted various canons designed more firmly to establish the system of polity and discipline recently imported into Ireland. Tithes had hitherto been paid grudgingly and partially: but the clergy, now backed by the power of the English crown, persevered in demanding them; and a regulation of this Synod illustrates the sharp practice employed in their exaction. According to this law "tithes were to be paid out of provisions, hay, the young of animals, wool, gardens, orchards, and *out of all things that grow and renew yearly,* under pain of an anathema after the third monition."[1] Such taxation certainly provided abundantly for the sustenance of the clergy: but it was not strange that the laity still resisted an assessment imposed without their concurrence.

This provincial Synod occupies an important place among the ecclesiastical conventions held in Ireland after the English invasion. It commenced its proceedings on the Lord's day, and continued a considerable time in session. On the second day of meeting the abbot of Baltinglass—a native named Albin O'Mulloy—preached a sermon which created no little sensation. Not a few Irish ecclesiastics, before the introduction of Romanism among them, had been married; but it would appear that a canon of the Synod of Kells had prohibited matrimony, so that clerical celibacy was now the law of the Church. It is, however, one thing to make a rule, and quite another to secure its observance. A number of the Irish priests still entered clandestinely into wedlock;[2] the ministers of foreign birth acted more openly: and some of

support him and his retinue during the visitation, the limitation to so many days was introduced.

[1] Lanigan, iv. 271.

[2] Even some bishops at this period were of clerical extraction. Thus, in the *Annals of Ulster* at A.D. 1185, we read of a bishop O'Murray who was buried at Derry "*at his father's feet, the bishop O'Coffy*, on the side of the church." See O'Donovan's *Four Masters*, iii. 68, 69, *note.* Innocent III., who filled the Papal chair from A.D. 1198 to A.D. 1216, wrote to his legate in Ireland instructing him to abolish in that country the practice of sons and grandsons succeeding their fathers and grandfathers in ecclesiastical benefices. *Ciaconius De Vitis Pontificum*, col. 624. Romae, 1630.

them outraged all propriety by their gross licentiousness. The abbot of Baltinglass, in his synodical discourse, attacked these transgressors. His denunciations produced a wonderful commotion in the assembly. Several of the British clergy now settled in the county of Wexford, and present in the Synod, admitted that they had wives or concubines; but they were scarcely prepared for the bitter rebuke administered: and, when remonstrating, they made such awkward revelations that they exposed themselves to the ridicule of their Irish brethren. On the third day of the Synod, Gerald Barry—a Welsh archdeacon who had arrived about twelve months before in Ireland in the capacity of tutor and secretary to Prince John[1]—was invited by Archbishop Cumin to express his sentiments. This ecclesiastic—whose name we have more than once already had occasion to mention, and who is better known to posterity as Giraldus Cambrensis[2]—possessed a large share of the learning of the age; and, as brother of Philip Barry[3]—a brave commander employed in Ireland in the royal service—held a high social position. Cambrensis looked on a wedded priest with no such abhorrence as the abbot of Baltinglass; for he gives us to understand, in one of his publications, that the devil never put any greater mischief into the heads of the rulers of the Church than when he induced them to forbid the marriage of the clergy.[4] According to his own acknowledgment a number of the Welsh ecclesiastics under his immediate care[5] lived without disturbance in

[1] This was Gerald's second visit to Ireland. He had visited it before in A.D. 1183. See Lanigan, iv. 254.

[2] His works have been recently published among the Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland during the middle ages, by the authority of the Treasury under the direction of the Master of the Rolls.

[3] *Expug. Hibern.*, lib. ii., c. 20. Philip and his brother Gerald were the nephews of Fitz-Stephen, one of the original adventurers who invaded Ireland. Giraldus has been long considered a calumniator of the Irish by a certain party in the country; and hence, as already stated, in the seventeenth century, Lynch, under the name of Gratianus Lucius, assailed him in a work entitled *Cambrensis Eversus*, which has been recently republished by the Celtic Society.

[4] *Gemma Ecclesiastica*, d. ii., cap. vi. Giraldus here states distinctly that Scripture gives no sanction to clerical celibacy.

[5] *Gemma Ecclesiastica*, by Brewer, preface, 43, 52, 53. London, 1862. We have it on the highest authority that, in A.D. 1107, the sons of the priests consti-

uncanonical concubinage. The excessive vanity of Giraldus frequently exposed him to awkward bantering; but he was a ready and graceful speaker; and he was therefore, we may presume, selected by the Dublin primate to repel the attack of the abbot of Baltinglass. Though the Welsh divine made no attempt, in his reply, to extenuate the charge preferred against his countrymen, he mixed up some tart remarks with compliments to the native clergy. "They are," said he, "well worthy of commendation for their attention to religion; and, among the various virtues which distinguish them, the prerogative of chastity is striking and pre-eminent.[1] They likewise attend vigilantly to their psalms and hours, to reading and prayer. . . . Of abstinence also and self-denial as to food they are very observant, so that the greatest part of them fast almost every day until dusk—when they have gone through all their canonical offices."[2] Whilst he thus far acknowledged the merits of the Irish brethren, he made other allegations which sorely stained their reputation. He asserted that they were barbarous and treacherous; and that, though abstemious during the day, they indulged in copious potations during the night.[3] In a spirit of exaggeration for which he was notorious, he maintained that the Hibernian Bishops, since the days of St. Patrick, had been negligent and inefficient.[4] These recriminations, as might have been anticipated, roused a storm of indignation; they widened the breach between the strangers and the native churchmen; and, though Cumin may have inwardly chuckled at the animadversions of his champion, he seems to have deemed it expedient not to manifest his concurrence by any outward indications of sympathy. In

---

tuted a large portion, if not the majority, of the clergy of the Church of England. See Wilkins's *Concilia*, vol. i., p. 387. London, 1737.

[1] This statement does not seem to tally with what we read in the *Life of Laurence O'Toole*, where we are told that he sent no less than 140 of the Irish clergy all the way to Rome to obtain from the Pope absolution for their incontinence. Lanigan would have us to believe that these offenders were Englishmen or Welshmen. See his *Ecc. Hist.* iv. 242.

[2] Giraldus *De Rebus a se gestis*, and *Topog. Distin.* iii. 27.

[3] *De Rebus a se gestis*, lib. ii., c. 14.

[4] Giraldus repeats this charge against the Irish bishops in his *Topog. Distin.* iii., c. 28. See also Lanigan, iv. 268.

the end a canon was framed ordaining that "no priest, deacon, or subdeacon, under pain of losing both his office and his benefice, should keep any female in his house, either as a servant, or under any other pretence whatever, except his mother, or sister, or some one whose age was sufficient to remove all suspicion of impropriety."[1]

Several of the remaining canons of this synod are conceived in a spirit intensely ritualistic. One of them directs that the wooden communion table hitherto used in Ireland at the celebration of the Eucharist is to be superseded by an altar of stone: another requires a lavatory of stone or wood to be erected in every church, and to be so contrived that "the last washings of the priest's hands," after the oblation, may pass away into the ground: according to another, an immovable font of stone or of wood, lined with lead, is to be provided in the house of God, and so constructed that, after the ceremony of baptism, "a secret pipe may convey the holy water down to mother earth:" another ordains that "any vessel used in baptism" is never afterwards to be applied to the common purposes of life: and another, under pain of anathema, forbids any one "to bury in a church yard, unless he can show by an authentic writing or undeniable evidence, that it was consecrated by a bishop, not only as a sanctuary or place of refuge, but also as a place of sepulchre."[2] Whilst so much attention was bestowed on these frivolous and superstitious regulations, the weightier matters of religion were completely overlooked. The reverend legislators made no suggestions relative to the cultivation of practical piety, to the education of candidates for the ministry, to the instruction of the young in the great doctrines of the gospel, to the preaching of the Word, or to the reading of the Scriptures. Their whole code of enactments may well lead to the melancholy inference that they were themselves sitting in darkness and in the valley of the shadow of death.

The subsequent career of archbishop Cumin, the president

---

[1] Lanigan, iv. 271. This ordinance did not put an end to concubinage among the Irish clergy. At a synod held in Dublin about A.D. 1270 additional regulations were made with a view to its suppression. See Wilkins's *Concilia*, i. 548.

[2] These canons may be found in Lanigan, iv. 269-272.

of this synod, illustrates the craven spirit generated by prevailing ignorance, as well as the impudent intimidation employed by ecclesiastical tyranny to bear down opposition. The diocese of Dublin, as we have seen, was only recently formed; and originally its bishop was the owner of no landed property. The city had been a Danish settlement; and its chief pastor had no jurisdiction beyond the walls. But when the Pope claimed to be lord paramount of Ireland, and bestowed the whole island on King Henry, the Dublin metropolitan began to think that he should have some share of the broad acres. He accordingly fixed his eye on certain districts in the neighbourhood of the Irish capital: and when Laurence O'Toole was in Rome in A.D. 1179, he found little difficulty in persuading Alexander III. to give him a Bull[1] confirming his title to these estates. O'Toole died shortly afterwards; and Cumin, his successor, at length discovered that he would not be permitted to retain undisturbed possession of the property. In A.D. 1197, Hamo De Valois, the Irish chief Governor, finding himself without means to meet the demands of the public service,[2] resolved to devote these lands to the maintenance of his government. The archbishop resisted; and proclaimed his determination to abandon his charge rather than yield to what he called a sacrilegious spoliation. He excommunicated the Viceroy and all who took part with him: left the kingdom; and placed the whole diocese under an interdict. Public worship was accordingly suspended;[3] books, chalices, and images were removed from the cathedral; and the crucifixes, crowned with thorns, were laid prostrate on the floors of the churches. Imposture was employed to add to the terror of the multitude. By appliances which priestcraft knew well how to use on such occasions, one of the fallen images was made to exhibit visible signs of agony. Water issued from its side; its eyes dropped tears; its face appeared inflamed; and it seemed to exude a bloody perspiration.[4] But though

[1] Lanigan, iv. 238-240.

[2] Leland, i. 163.

[3] Images appear to have been introduced into Irish churches shortly before this date. It is alleged that, at an earlier period, "the prejudices of the people were opposed to them."—STOKES'S *Life of Petric*, p. 297.

[4] Giraldus Cambrensis, i. 393. There seems to have been some machinery

the Viceroy, for the time, stood proof against these mock miracles, and refused to surrender the disputed property, it is obvious that this spiritual intimidation generated some qualms of conscience. Several years afterwards he is said to have granted to the See of Dublin twenty plough lands[1] as an atonement for his depredations.

Strange as it may appear, the English invasion forms something like an era in the history of Irish ecclesiastical architecture. Shortly after the recognition of the authority of the British monarch, splendid abbeys in Dublin, Cork, Tipperary, Wexford, Meath, Down, and elsewhere, were erected by the invaders.[2] It might have been expected that, in the unsettled condition of the country, the thoughts of men would have been turned into quite another channel; but wonderful virtue was now ascribed to the erection of such edifices; and the native princes vied with the foreigners in contributing to their multiplication.[3] In our own days we may gaze with admiration

---

connected with this image, by means of which the priests contrived, on special occasions, to act on the credulity of the multitude. See Gilbert's *History of Dublin*, i. 99-101. Dublin, 1854.

[1] Every ploughland, according to some authorities, contained sixty acres. *Camb. Eversus*, by Kelly, iii. 302, *note.* The See of Dublin is said to have possessed thirty-seven manors in the time of Archbishop Cumin.—*Ware*, i. 299. According to another authority a *Ballybetagh* contained the thirtieth part of a barony; and comprised four ploughlands, *each containing one hundred and twenty acres* of the large Irish measure. Hardiman's *Statute of Kilkenny*, p. 5, *note.* Dublin, 1843. In point of fact, the ploughland in one district was much larger than the same denomination in another. In some places the Ballybetagh contained twelve ploughlands of sixty acres each. *Calendar of the Patent and Close Rolls of Chancery in Ireland*, vol. ii., preface, pp. 56, 57. Dublin, 1862. A ploughland was sometimes called a *caracute.*

[2] Phelan's *History of the Policy of the Church of Rome in Ireland.* Remains, ii. 72. Phelan asserts that these abbeys were erected "within eight years" after the arrival of the English; but the statement is obviously incorrect. The Viceroy Fitz-Aldelm founded a monastery at Dublin in honour of Thomas à Becket. In 1182 the Abbey of Dunbrody, Co. Wexford, was founded by Hervey De Monte Morisco. The Viceroy, Philip of Worcester, founded a Benedictine Priory at Kilcumin in Tipperary. In 1200 a Cistercian Abbey was founded in Co. Wexford by William Mareschal the Elder, Earl of Pembroke. Lanigan, iv. 233, 252, 262, 335. In 1193 the Priory of Kells in Kilkenny was founded by Geoffry Fitz-Robert. Brenan, p. 257.

[3] It has been remarked that the fine arts declined in Ireland "from the end of the twelfth century." See Stoke's *Life of Petrie*, p. 299.

on the remains of these beautiful structures, and we may recognize them as evidences of the taste and skill of the workmen of other generations: but we grievously mistake if we imagine that they supply proof of the enlightened piety of their founders. There may be fine aesthetic sentiment where there is no relish for the beauty of holiness.[1] Herod the Great, who rebuilt the temple of Jerusalem in such splendour, was a monster of iniquity. He put to death several members of his own family; he slew all the infants in Bethlehem and its neighbourhood; and, had he been permitted, he would have imbrued his hands in the blood of the Lord of Glory. Not a few of those who now built churches and abbeys in Ireland were persons of very equivocal reputation. Dermod McMurrough—whose horrid crimes drove him from the throne of Leinster, and who betrayed his country to Strongbow and the other military adventurers by whom it was invaded—ranks high among the patrons of its ecclesiastical architecture.[2] Strongbow himself—though he had certainly no claim to saintship—founded a priory for Knights Templars at Kilmainham, near Dublin.[3] John De Courcy—who cruelly pillaged and desolated part of Ulster—erected several so-called religious houses in the district which had suffered so sadly from his depredations;[4] and, in A.D. 1193, Africa, his wife—daughter of the king of the Isle of Man—built there an abbey,—known as

---

[1] The people of India before their subjugation by England, were sunk in the grossest pagan superstition; and yet even then, as Lord Macaulay has remarked, they had "cities larger and fairer than Saragossa or Toledo, and buildings more beautiful and costly than the Cathedral of Seville."—*Essays.* "Lord Clive."

[2] He built the Nunnery of St. Mary de Hogges, near Dublin, in 1146; in 1151 he built two other nunneries, viz:—Kilclehin, in the County of Kilkenny, and Athaddy in the County of Carlow; he erected also and endowed the Abbey of Baltinglass; he founded and richly endowed a monastery at Ferns; and lastly he founded the Priory of All Saints on Hoggingreen—now College Green—and on that part of it where Trinity College at present stands. Lanigan, iv. 185-6. Notwithstanding all this building of conventual establishments, he died in May, 1171, in a state of extreme wretchedness. See Leland, i. 52.

[3] Brenan's *Ecc. Hist.*, p. 265.

[4] In his foundation charters De Courcy stated that he had made these grants for the welfare of the souls of himself, his wife Africa, their ancestors, and successors, as well as for the souls of those who gave him counsel and aid towards acquiring Ulster, and for those who fell, or might fall, in his service. Gilbert's *Viceroys*, p. 502.

Grey abbey,—the ruins of which still stand as memorials of the elegance of its decorative workmanship.[1] The powerful Hugh De Lacy, who has been described by the Irish annalists as "the profaner and destroyer of many churches,"[2] founded two monasteries in Meath—one at Duleek, and another at Colp near the mouth of the Boyne.[3] By such donations to the monastic orders, according to the testimony of a learned Roman Catholic historian, "these adventurers and plunderers endeavoured to atone for their robberies in Ireland, committed not only on the laity, but likewise on the native clergy of the country."[4]

The new monasteries which now made their appearance in all parts of the island, were of a very different character from those erected in it six or seven hundred years before. They were structures—not of wood and wattles, or of rude masonry—but of stone, in many cases beautifully chiselled; and yet, like the churches built in the days of Constantine the Great, their superior architecture could not conceal the fact that they accommodated the professors of a deteriorated Christianity. They were erected—not for such monks as those once governed by Columbkille or Kieran—but for Cistercians, or Canons Regular of St. Augustin, or other foreign orders, introduced about the time that Irish Synods adopted the dogma of the Papal supremacy. The old Irish monasteries were schools of learning where the young received a liberal education,—where the New Testament was read in the original language, and where Greek and Latin literature was cultivated: the new establishments were the abodes of useless

---

[1] Harris, in his *Ancient and Present State of the County of Down* (Dublin, 1744), says, p. 49, that Africa was buried there, adding that her "image, made of grey stone *in alto relievo*, much defaced, with her hands closed in a posture of devotion," was to be seen in his time "fixed in an arch of the wall on the gospel side of the high altar." "The remains of this abbey," says he, "show it to have been a large and sumptuous building."

[2] O'Donovan's *Annals of the Four Masters*, at A.D. 1186.

[3] Lanigan, iv. 252. De Lacy, for military reasons, demolished the monastery of Durrow, built by Columbkille, and erected a castle on its site. In 1186, he was assassinated as he was surveying the new building. His death was regarded by the natives as a judgment for pulling down the monastery.

[4] Lanigan, iv. 252.

drones or gloomy fanatics, where the Bible was a strange book, and where little was known beyond manuals of devotion or legends of saints. The institutes over which Comghall and Columbkille presided shed their light over Europe, and students from distant shores sought their illumination; the new buildings presented no such attractions to lovers of knowledge either at home or abroad; and the light which they radiated only rendered darkness visible. The old brotherhoods acknowledged no foreign jurisdiction; the new fraternities submitted themselves to the dictation of the Pope; and many of them were connected with houses in Great Britain on which they were dependent.[1] The old monasteries were tenanted by natives; the new buildings were occupied by monks from England.[2] Some of the most famous of the old institutes suffered severely from the invaders. The monastery of Clonard was reduced to a heap of ruins by Dermod McMurrough and his English allies; Lismore was plundered by Strongbow; and Armagh was plundered by John De Courcy.[3]

In the dreary abodes of bigotry erected by the English, the inmates moped away existence in inglorious monotony. The routine of monastic discipline neither improved the heart, nor braced the intellect, nor enlarged the sphere of information. No honest piece of autobiography, such as the *Confession* of Patrick; no commentary, such as that of Sedulius *On the Epistles of Paul*, issued from these costly edifices. The life of Patrick was, indeed, a favourite theme with those who were disposed to engage in original composition; but the Apostle of Ireland was miserably misrepresented and caricatured by his silly biographers. Among those who engaged in this department of literature, Jocelin has attained special notoriety. He had been a monk of Furness in Lancashire; and, along with others of his fraternity, had removed to Down, where John

---

[1] Thus Hugh De Lacy's Augustine monastery of Duleek was made a cell to the Priory of Llanthony, near Gloucester; and that which he founded at Colp was made a cell to another Llanthony, in Monmouthshire. See many other instances in King's *Primer*, ii. 574-5.

[2] See King's *Primer*, ii. 575.

[3] Brenan's *Ecc. Hist.*, p. 267; Malone's *Church History of Ireland*, pp. 93-105.

De Courcy erected a Cistercian monastery.[1] At the request of this English adventurer, who was his patron, and who is complimented by him with the title of "the most illustrious Prince of Ulidia,"[2] he wrote *The Life and Acts of Saint Patrick*.[3] He states, in his preface, that the Bishop of Down and the Archbishop of Armagh had likewise encouraged him to engage in the undertaking. All these personages had a direct interest in exalting the reputation of the great Irish missionary; and though the work of Jocelin abounds in most absurd tales of miracles and prodigies, it seems to have been not unsuited to the taste of the readers of the twelfth century.[4] Dublin now threatened to take precedence in ecclesiastical rank; and the work of the Cistercian monk was no doubt regarded as a most seasonable publication by the Archbishop of Armagh; for it was well fitted to uphold the claims of the primatial see of Ulster.

In the beginning of the thirteenth century a vacancy in this See led to a controversy which attracted much public notice. In the grants of lands to British settlers the right of presentation to bishoprics and abbeys was reserved to the crown;[5] but the sovereign often found it difficult to secure the patronage. The native clergy submitted with impatience to the foreigners placed over them; and—when a prelate died—frequently endeavoured, by a hasty election, to promote one of their own countrymen. Some such attempt appears to have been made at Killaloe in A.D. 1216, when, according to the Irish annals, the viceroy, De Maurisco, interfered, built a fortress in

[1] Lanigan, iv. 249. This abbey was called Iniscourcy, and was erected on the peninsula of Inis or Inch, opposite to Downpatrick. Gilbert's *Viceroys*, p. 60.

[2] The name *Uladh*, originally given to the Northern Province, was now confined to a territory comprising Co. Down and part of Co. Antrim, and was latinised *Ulidia*. This territory was sometimes called *Dalaradia*.

[3] See O'Donovan's *Annals of the Four Masters*, iii. 33, *note*.

[4] The latest *Life of Patrick*—the magnificent volume by Miss Cusack, published a few months ago—is little better than a beautifully illustrated book of fiction.

[5] Leland, i. 183. *The Unity of the Anglican Church and the succession of Irish Bishops*. By Archdeacon Stopford, p. 10. Dublin, 1867. "Chapters were repeatedly obliged to give security that they would not attempt to elect without license (from the King) first obtained. The Chapter of Kilfenora gave such security A.D. 1265; the Chapter of Enaghdune A.D. 1308; the Chapter of Armagh A.D. 1247."—*Ibid*, p. 19.

the place, and "forced the inhabitants to receive an English bishop."[1] The primacy of Armagh was a more important as well as a more lucrative appointment: it excited keener competition; and here the king and the Pope came into collision. On the demise of the Primate, Thomas O'Conor, in A.D. 1201, King John nominated Humphry De Tickhull, an Englishman, as his successor; but the suffragan bishops and a portion of the clergy ventured to choose an Irishman named Eugene McGillivider. The papal chair was then filled by Innocent III., a man of extraordinary ability and energy; and, when Eugene repaired to Rome to solicit support, the Pope confirmed his election; and he was accordingly consecrated Archbishop. John still refused to yield; issued a peremptory mandate to the clergy of the province forbidding them, on pain of his displeasure, to acknowledge Eugene as their metropolitan; and though De Tickhull died in 1203, the king, bent on maintaining his patronage, nominated another Englishman, Ralph Le Petit, archdeacon of Meath, to the office. The contest continued for some years. The clergy of Armagh adhered to Eugene and the Pope; the king insisted on his right of presentation, and withheld the temporalities of the See. But this feeble and unworthy prince was at length obliged to give way. Accumulating troubles in England engrossed his thoughts, and a considerable donation of ready money presented to him in his difficulties—and without the apparent interference of the papal Archbishop—exerted a wonderfully soothing influence.[2] Eugene was established in his See, and Innocent achieved a triumph which he knew well how to improve.

In A.D. 1215 Eugene McGillivider attended a general council held at Rome—commonly known as the Fourth Council of Lateran. Three other Irish prelates sat in this assembly, viz., the Archbishop of Dublin, the Archbishop of Cashel, and the Bishop of Killaloe.[3] The Primate of Armagh

---

[1] *Annals of Clonmacnois*, as quoted by O'Donovan *Annals of the Four Masters*, iii. 190, *note*. The name of the English bishop was Robert Travers. He was deprived in 1221, and the See was afterwards filled almost exclusively by Irishmen till the Reformation. *Ibid.*

[2] Leland, i. 184.

[3] See Ware's *Bishops*.

died at Rome soon after the close of the proceedings:[1] the Bishop of Killaloe did not long survive his return to Ireland.[2] This Council of Lateran holds a conspicuous place in the history of the Church. The doctrine of Transubstantiation had been promulgated long before; but the use of the *word* was here sanctioned for the first time by the highest ecclesiastical authority.[3] The practice of confession to a priest, at least once a year, was now commanded, under pain of excommunication.[4] No such general law had ever before existed.

In the following year another council of a diocesan character, but remarkable for some of the arrangements it adopted, was held in Ireland. Notwithstanding the resolutions of the synods of Rathbreasail and Kells, the system of diocesan episcopacy had not yet been fully established. Parochial and village bishops were still to be found here and there[5]—as specimens of the rulers of the old Irish Church, and as memorials of the modern origin of the present hierarchy. These, however, gradually disappeared; and an ordinance agreed on at a synod held by Simon Rochfort,[6] Bishop of Meath, at Trim in A.D. 1216, enables us to see how the ecclesiastical revolution was accomplished. This remarkable document makes the following curious revelations:—"Whereas Lord John Paparo . . . Legate in Ireland of our Lord the

---

[1] O'Donovan's *Annals of the Four Masters*, at A.D. 1216.

[2] *Ibid*, at A.D. 1215.

[3] Gieseler's *Text-Book of Ecc. Hist.*, vol. ii. 331.

[4] Gieseler, ii. 350.

[5] D'Alton has remarked that there were bishops of Mayo, a small village in the present county of that name, "for centuries after the rural bishoprics had generally merged by the decrees of the synod of Cardinal Paparo."—*Hist. of Ireland*, ii. 114, *note*. Under the year 1216, the *Annals of Kilronan* record the death of the bishop of *Knockmoy*—a place in County Galway, about six miles from Tuam. O'Donovan's *Four Masters*, iii. 191 *note*, 194 *note*. At A.D. 1226, in the *Annals of the Four Masters*, we read of the death of the bishop of *Leyny*, a place in County Sligo. In A.D. 1241 the death of the bishop of *Enaghdune*, or Annadown, is recorded.—*Annals of the Four Masters*. Anaghduagh or Enaghdune was only a few miles from Tuam. Moran's *Hist of the Catholic Archbishops of Dublin*, p. 54. Dublin, 1864. The bishop of Enaghdune was present at the coronation of Richard I., A.D. 1189. This little bishopric long maintained a struggle for existence. See Harris's *Ware*, vol. i. 605-6, Archbishops of Tuam; and Cotton's *Fasti*, iv. 52.

[6] He was the first Englishman who presided over the See of Meath. He was bishop for thirty years, that is, from 1194 to 1224. Cotton's *Fasti*, iii. 111

Supreme Pontiff Eugenius III., did in the General Synod held at Kells in Meath in the year of grace 1152, ordain, among other salutary constitutions then and there made, that on the death of village bishops and bishops of the smaller Sees in Ireland, there should be chosen to succeed in their stead archpresbyters (or rural deans) to be appointed by the diocesans, who are to have the charge of the clergy and people within their respective districts, and that their Sees should be erected into so many heads of rural deaneries—We therefore, the Bishop above named, in compliance with his enactment, appoint and ordain as follows:—That in the churches of Trim, Kells, Slane, Skyrne, and Dunshaughlin, formerly bishop's Sees in Meath, but now heads of rural deaneries, the archpresbyters hereafter to be appointed, shall not only be constantly and permanently resident therein, but shall also attend to the charge of the clergy and people within the limits of the said deaneries."[1]

Though a few places, disfranchised as bishoprics by the synod of Kells, still continued to retain their episcopal dignity; others, recognized as such by that assembly, were soon absorbed in adjacent dioceses. Thus, the bishopric of Iniscathy—an island near the mouth of the Shannon—was annexed, on the death of its pastor in A.D. 1188, to the See of Limerick.[2] Glendalough[3] was, in like manner, added to the diocese of Dublin. But this latter union was not so easily effected. In more ancient times the abbot of Glendalough had been a great personage, and had presided over a territory extending to the very walls of what was now the Irish capital. When diocesan episcopacy was established, the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Glendalough was equally ample; but his neighbour the Archbishop was dissatisfied, and sought to circumscribe his boun-

[1] Wilkins's *Concilia*, tom. i. 547. London, 1737.

[2] See O'Donovan's *Four Masters*, iii. 80, *note*. According to another account the three Sees of Iniscathy, Roscrea, and Killaloe were converted into one. *Hist. Mem. of the O'Briens*, p. 106.

[3] This name is descriptive of the district, as it signifies *the glen of two loughs*. Other unions took place about this time. Soon after the arrival of the English, Ardmore was incorporated with Lismore. Cotton's *Fasti*, i. 158, 212. Roscrea was united to Killaloe. Cotton, i. 476. For other unions see Cotton, iv. 95; iv. 130; iv, 131; iv. 132.

daries. The synod of Kells had resolved that, on the death of the existing occupant of the See of Glendalough, the bishopric should be suppressed and its parishes transferred to Dublin. But on the occurrence of the first vacancy the arrangement was not carried into execution. Laurence O'Toole, who had previously been abbot of Glendalough, was now Archbishop of Dublin. He was aware that the change was offensive to his kinsmen, who were the chieftains of the district; and he scrupled to annihilate a See to which he was himself attached by early associations. His successor, Archbishop Cumin, had no such difficulties; and, during his administration of the affairs of the archdiocese, the royal sanction was obtained for carrying out the resolution of the synod of Kells. No change however occurred till the death of William Peryn, or Pero, Bishop of Glendalough in A.D. 1214. Even then the local clergy, aided by powerful septs in the county of Wicklow, resisted the proposal; but at length their consent was obtained on the condition that a cathedral was to be established within the limits of the bishopric. Christ Church had some time before been made the cathedral of the diocese of Dublin; and Saint Patrick's—which stood on the very verge of Glendalough—was now advanced to a similar dignity.[1] It was accordingly enlarged and beautified; furnished with a dean, chancellor, and other officials; and largely endowed.[2] Thus, according to the statement of a subsequent primate,[3] Christ Church was united to St. Patrick's, "under one spouse," saving to the former "the prerogative of honour."[4] This compromise did not prove satisfactory: there were contests for precedence between the

[1] Brenan's *Eccl. Hist.* Mason, in his *History and Antiquities of the Collegiate and Cathedral Church of St. Patrick*, alleges (p. 5, *note*) that the site is *not* within the old diocese of Glendalough; and appeals, in support of his views, to two Bulls of Alexander III. in A.D. 1179; but these authorities are not decisive; as the diocese of Glendalough seems to have been previously curtailed, and part of it added to Dublin. It is expressly stated that, in A.D. 1152, the diocese of Glendalough extended to the very walls of Dublin, and that St. Patrick's *was in the suburbs*. See Ware's *Archbishops of Dublin*, John Cumin and Henry De Loundres.

[2] Harris's *History of Dublin*, p. 377. We are thus reminded that deans, and other officials unknown in more ancient times, were introduced along with the system of diocesan episcopacy.

[3] Archbishop Allan who lived in the reign of Henry VIII. Harris, p. 377.

[4] Brenan's *Ecc. Hist.*, pp. 288-9.

clergy of Christ Church and the Dean and Chapter of St. Patrick's; the septs of Wicklow refused to acquiesce in the extinction of the See; and it was subsequently revived. Bishops are found there until nearly the beginning of the sixteenth century.[1]

During the period to which our attention is at present directed, the Pope reached the climax of his arrogance and tyranny. The Emperor of Germany now condescended to hold the stirrup of the mitred sovereign;[2] the greatest princes of the age quailed before his interdicts; and Henry II. himself submitted to penance—very humiliating to a proud spirit—that he might appease his wrath. Many of the prelates of higher rank now displayed a most overbearing disposition; and when Archbishop Cumin excommunicated the Irish chief governor, and deprived a whole diocese of the ordinances of religion, because the State ventured to interfere with property to which he had but a dubious claim,[3] he only walked in the footsteps of his Pontifical master. The introduction of diocesan episcopacy had produced a complete change on the face of the Irish Church: the recognition of the supremacy of the Pope had given the bishops quite a new position in relation to the people: and the establishment of the English power in the country, under the auspices of Rome, had contributed vastly to the augmentation of hierarchical arrogance. The Irish bishops were now a very different class of men from those who had before been known by the same designation. The old pastors were the teachers of the Church, and the moral guides of the community; but they held a comparatively humble rank; they were generally without wealth; and each looked up for protection to the chieftain of his district. The new prelates were important political personages: some of them possessed much power and affluence: they

[1] In A.D. 1497 it was finally extinguished on the death of Dennis White. See Ledwich, pp. 185-6, and Lanigan, iv. 320.

[2] We read, in the *Chronicle of Benedict of Peterborough*, how, in A.D. 1177, the Emperor met the Pope at Venice; and, after mass, conducted him to the church door, and held his stirrup as he mounted his palfrey.

[3] O'Toole himself evidently felt that there was a defect in his title when he deemed it necessary to apply to the Pope for *confirmation* of it.

were ready to measure their strength with any of the petty princes around them: and the viceroy himself—as in the case of Cumin—found it almost impossible to curb their pretensions. They could withstand the Crown by appealing to the Pope; and, supported by their chief in Italy, they not unfrequently contrived to prevail against the reigning Sovereign.

This exaltation of the hierarchy did not tend to promote the improvement of the Church. Many of the bishops and archbishops are henceforth known as mere politicians, immersed in the management of affairs of state. In A.D. 1213 Henry De Loundres, the successor of Cumin in the diocese of Dublin, was appointed Justiciary, or Viceroy of Ireland—an office of vast responsibility, sufficient to occupy all his time and to tax all his energies to the uttermost. It was impossible for any man invested with such a trust to discharge his clerical duties with efficiency; and yet the precedent thus established was often followed. The successors of De Loundres in the archbishopric, as well as the Bishops of other Sees, are frequently found employed in the administration of the government of the country. Not a few of the prelates set over the Irish Church were English adventurers, who had secured their places by the influence of family connections; and, when in office, they exhibited a far greater anxiety to add to their emoluments than to advance the interests of religion. About this time a contest between the Bishop of Waterford and the Bishop of Lismore,[1] for the possession of some property claimed by both, long kept the whole district around them in a state of disturbance. David, Bishop of Waterford, lost his life in a riot which took place during the progress of the controversy. But his successor Robert continued the struggle. One of his partisans, at the head of a body of his retainers, seized the Bishop of Lismore in his cathedral; hurried him to Dungarvan; threw him into prison; and loaded him with irons.[2] The Bishop of Waterford was excommunicated; but he seemed to care little for the sentence. Through the mediation of the King the censure was removed. Robert

[1] Lismore was united to Waterford by the Synod of Rathbreasail; but they were separated again before the Synod of Kells.

[2] Brenan's *Ecc. Hist.*, p. 291.

escaped with comparative impunity, and remained till his death in the enjoyment of his episcopal dignity.

Pope Adrian professed to be animated by a concern for the religious improvement of the Irish people when he handed them over to Henry II. If he really meant to elevate their condition he was signally unfortunate. The English invasion is the commencement of the most dismal period in their history. The Hibernian Church is no longer the Star of the West, the brightest spot in the ecclesiastical firmament. It has parted with its primitive simplicity and its ecclesiastical freedom. Ireland did not receive from its Anglo-Norman rulers any benefit equivalent to the loss of its independence. The transference of its inhabitants to the dominion of South Britain promoted their spiritual as well as their civil degradation. Too many of the clergy, sent across the Channel to occupy lucrative ecclesiastical positions, were the very off-scourings of the Church of England; and they contributed neither by their instruction nor example to the enlightenment of the country. The native clergy felt that they were discountenanced and dishonoured; and the whole Church was disturbed by heartburnings, alienations, and divisions. But the power of the Pope advanced apace. The dissatisfied appealed to his tribunal for redress of grievances. He knew how to decide so as to make both parties more dependent on himself; and thus, whilst the country was sinking deeper and deeper into an abyss of ignorance, his claims, as the alleged keeper of the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, were maintained with increasing confidence and success.

CHAPTER III.

FROM THE DEATH OF KING JOHN TO THE DEATH OF KING EDWARD I. A.D. 1216 TO A.D. 1307.[1]

A BEAUTIFUL temple is not always an evidence of the existence of a pious congregation. Superstition may erect a structure which enlightened zeal may find it difficult to emulate; and the hands which build or decorate the walls may be very seldom clasped in devotion. Were we to judge of the state of religion in Ireland by the multiplication of its ecclesiastical edifices, we might infer that the thirteenth century was one of the brightest periods in the history of its Church; and yet we have melancholy proof that the nation was then in much the same spiritual condition as were the degenerate Jews when they built the tombs of the prophets, and garnished the sepulchres of the righteous. No small number of the abbeys of that date, exhibiting fine specimens of workmanship, owed their existence to men who were steeped in crime. They were avowedly erected "for the health of the souls" of the benefactors and their ancestors[2] —an announcement which too frequently indicates that they were designed, not for the glory of God, but as an atonement for lives of iniquity. Within a century and a half after the Synod of Cashel, one hundred and sixty so-called religious houses were founded and endowed by the English

---

1 Henry III. A.D. 1216 to A.D. 1272: Edward I. A.D. 1272 to A.D. 1307.

2 Mant's *History of the Church of Ireland*, i. 48. Lanigan himself says expressly that this was then the "fashionable mode of purchasing off sins and obtaining forgiveness from Heaven," iv. 253.

settlers;[1] whilst a considerable number besides were provided by the natives themselves. Most of these buildings made their appearance during the reigns of Henry III. and Edward I. The Dominicans arrived in Ireland in A.D. 1224;[2] and immediately afterwards several establishments belonging to the order were erected. They soon had convents in Dublin, Drogheda, Kilkenny, Waterford, Cork, Mullingar, Cashel, Tralee, Coleraine, Sligo, Roscommon, and Derry, as well as in places of less importance.[3] The first Irish Franciscan convent was founded at Youghal by Maurice Fitzgerald in A.D. 1230.[4] Others soon followed in Carrickfergus,[5] Kilkenny, Dublin, Athlone, Wexford, Limerick, Dundalk, Kildare, Armagh, and elsewhere.[6] The Augustinians, the Carmelites, the Knights Templars, and kindred fraternities, likewise founded houses in connection with their respective orders.

The introduction of these new brotherhoods, and their settlement in so many districts, tended greatly to promote the papal influence throughout Ireland. Unlike the old Irish monks, they were all bound securely to the pontifical throne. They were under the immediate inspection of the great Italian Bishop: they kept up constant intercourse with

---

[1] King's *Primer*, ii. 565; Phelan's *Policy of the Church of Rome.* Remains, ii. p. 100.

[2] *Hibernia Dominicana*, p. 38.

[3] *Ibid.* In 1762 there had been no less than eighty-three Irish prelates connected with the Dominicans, of whom eighteen were archbishops and sixty-five were bishops. See *Hib. Dom.*, p. 453.

[4] *Hibernia Dominicana*, p. 42.

[5] Carrickfergus, which signifies the *Rock of Fergus*, was so named, according to tradition, because Fergus, a king of the Albanian Scots, was drowned there—probably at the rock on which the castle now stands. Stanihurst *De Rebus in Hib. Gestis*, lib. i. p. 26.

[6] Brenan pp. 309-313. William de Burgh, in 1296, is said to have founded the Franciscan monastery of Galway. "The endowments which De Burgh gave to this monastery were very numerous, and consisted of water-mills upon the river, and the tithes of some acres of arable land near the city; and, that our friars should never lack fish, he ordained that on *every Wednesday* they should be supplied with *one salmon* out of the great weir, on *every Saturday* with *three* out of the high weir, and *on the same day* with *one* out of the haul-net; and with *all the eels* that might be taken *one day in each week* out of the many eel weirs on the river."—Meehan's *Rise and Fall of the Irish Franciscan Monasteries*, p. 74. Dublin, 1869.

Rome;[1] and they were continually proclaiming the power and prerogatives of the heir of St. Peter. The Dominicans and Franciscans took the lead in exalting his reputation. They professed to live on alms; they travelled everywhere, soliciting contributions for their maintenance; they created no little confusion by preaching and administering the sacraments without consulting the parochial clergy; but they contrived meanwhile to mix with all classes of the people, and to infuse into the minds of the masses the leaven of new errors and superstitions. From the date of the appearance of the foreign monks—more especially of the mendicants—we may trace the rapid growth of Romish principles and practices. We now hear more and more of auricular confession, of the veneration of relics, of the horrors of purgatory, and of the worship of the Virgin.[2] We read of churches and abbeys "devoted to God and Saint Mary, and the blessed Peter, and the blessed Patrick;"[3] or founded "in honour of God and St. John"[4]—as if the High and Holy One inhabiting eternity would permit any portion of His glory to be given to another. The Synod of Kells, in A.D. 1152, had required the payment of tithes; and the Synod of Cashel, twenty years later, repeated the injunction; but the demand does not appear to have been generally conceded until about fifty years after the English invasion. When describing the reign of a celebrated king of Connaught—Charles O'Conor of the Red Hand, who died in A.D. 1224—the native annalists make the announcement that "in his time was tithe paid and established in Ireland first legally."[5] This prince was a great patron of the mendicant friars;[6] and they seem to have induced him to

[1] The *Annals of Clonmacnois*, at A.D. 1288, state that "there were fifteen ecclesiastical men, both abbots and priors, drowned this year coming from Rome upon the coasts of Ireland." O'Donovan's *Four Masters*, iii 449.

[2] The worship of Mary seems to have been greatly promoted by a defeat which the Irish chieftains sustained from the English in A.D. 1249. The defeat was attributed to their making an attack "on the day of our Lady, the Blessed Virgin Mary, in the midst of harvest."—O'Donovan's *Four Masters*, iii. 335, *note*. The day here referred to seems to have been the 8th of September, the reputed birthday of Mary.

[3] Mant, i. 54.

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] O'Donovan's *Four Masters*, iii. 210, *note*, and iii. 213.

[6] He is said to have died in the habit of a Grey Friar.—O'Donovan's *Four Masters*, iii. 213.

lend his powerful influence for the collection of a tax which had hitherto been keenly contested. As payment was enjoined by the authority of the Pope, and as part of the tribute was to be given to the poor,[1] we can easily understand why the mendicants took such an interest in the question.

The clergy of Ireland, in earlier times, possessed no civil power. They were amenable to the same laws as the rest of the population; and for ages they were not exempt even from military service.[2] When they committed offences against the State, they were accountable, like other men, to secular tribunals.[3] But new ideas were introduced along with diocesan episcopacy; and the hierarchy, now sustained by the power of England, occupied an entirely new position. The prelates claimed precedence of the great officers of government; and their pretensions were conceded. Henry II. recognized them as the first order of peers when he addressed a writ to his "archbishops, bishops, kings, earls, barons, and all his liegemen of Ireland;"[4] and Henry III. still more emphatically endorsed their title when he dictated a communication directed to the venerable father Luke, "archbishop of Dublin, *and* to his trusty and well-beloved Maurice Fitzgerald, his lord deputy"[5]—thus ranking the Viceroy after the Primate. The prelates did not fail to stretch their prerogatives to the utmost. The spiritual courts—instead of confining themselves to the administration of a godly discipline, so as to promote the purification of the Church—intruded into the province of the magistrate, and inflicted civil pains and penalties. The clergy claimed exemption from the jurisdiction of the king's judges; and the bishops so interpreted their ecclesiastical authority as to bring almost all causes within the scope of

---

[1] A capitulary of Charlemagne regulates the division of tithes into three parts; one for the bishop and his clergy, one *for the poor*, and one for the support of the fabric of the church. The mendicants might claim assistance under the second division.

[2] See before, p. 55, note [2].

[3] See Phelan's *Policy of the Church of Ireland.* Remains, ii. 96.

[4] King's *Primer*, ii. 560-1.

[5] *Ibid.* ii. 561; see also Cox, p. 63.

their supervision.[1] Thus, whilst the Church was seeking to escape completely from secular control, the State was threatened with a yoke at once oppressive and irresponsible. The bishops were extremely desirous to take charge of all matters pertaining to the administration of wills;[2] and, by those interested in testamentary arrangements, frequent complaints were made of their tyranny and injustice. A petition addressed to Edward I. by a certain widow, named Margaret le Blunde, gives a startling view of the extent of the power they now exercised. The petitioner declares that property awarded to her by the king's judges had been detained by the Archbishop of Cashel; that this great churchman had killed her father; shut up and kept in prison her grandfather and grandmother until they perished by famine; and starved to death her six brothers and sisters, who claimed a share of the inheritance of which he retained possession. This widow—who was evidently a person of distinction,—states farther that the writs obtained by her in the king's courts had been rendered useless by the influence and bribery of her oppressor; and that she had been obliged no less than five times to cross the Irish sea to seek redress.[3] These form only a portion of the charges preferred against this Irish ecclesiastical dignitary.[4] The petitioner, it may be, has given way in her memorial to a spirit of exaggeration; but it is not probable that she would have ventured to prefer such charges, had they not rested on a solid foundation. The accused held a position which, as a minister of Him whose kingdom is not of this world, he had no right to occupy; and seems to have sadly abused his power.

---

[1] The Pope strenuously encouraged the Irish clergy to refuse to submit to lay tribunals. See a letter of Gregory IX. to the Archbishop of Cashel and his suffragans, dated December, A.D. 1231. Theiner's *Vetera Monumenta Hibernorum et Scotorum*, p. 28. Romae, 1864.

[2] The Pope expressly required them to reserve such matters for the ecclesiastical tribunals. Questions relating to tithes were also considered as under the special cognisance of the Church courts. The laity were thus almost helplessly exposed to clerical oppression. See a letter of Pope Urban IV. to the bishops and clergy of Ireland, dated December, A.D. 1263. Theiner, p. 92.

[3] See the petition in Leland, i. 234, *note*.

[4] His name was David MacCarwill. He was Archbishop from A.D. 1253 to A.D. 1289. See Harris's *Ware*, i. 472-475.

At this period the laws of the State not unfrequently conflicted with the laws of the Church. According to the common law, children born before wedlock were disinherited as illegitimate; according to the canon law, the subsequent marriage removed the disqualification. In such cases the civil and spiritual courts frequently came into collision; and the State found it no easy matter effectually to oppose the encroachments of the hierarchy. In A.D. 1233, Henry III. was obliged to issue a writ, addressed to his "earls, barons, knights, freemen, and all others of his land of Ireland," forbidding them to have various matters tried in Church courts "to the prejudice of his crown and dignity;" [1] and in A.D. 1266, "all archbishops, bishops, and other ecclesiastical judges" in the same country were informed, by royal proclamation, that "secular persons" could not be impleaded before a spiritual tribunal, "unless the suits against them were matrimonial or testamentary." [2] The bishops wielded immense influence by their use of the power of excommunication. This sentence involved the heaviest civil disabilities; it was fulminated against persons of all ranks and conditions; it was often employed; and many complaints were made of its capricious and unwarrantable exercise. By means of it a resolute bishop could contrive to maintain his ground against almost any antagonist; for it was believed that the man who incurred it, in its higher form, could neither "be saved by the Passion of Christ," nor aided by the Sacraments.[3] As resistance to the power of the Church was one of the offences by which it was incurred, it is easy to see how, when the civil and ecclesiastical courts disputed, it could at once be called into requisition.

---

[1] Cox, p. 62.

[2] Phelan's *Policy of the Church of Rome in Ireland.* Remains, ii. 77.

[3] King's *Primer,* ii. 593; Mant. i. 25. In 1245 Christian, Bishop of Emly, maintained against O'Sullivan, Bishop of Cloyne, "an assize of novel disseisin for a tenement in Kylcomyr, which he claimed in right of his See of Emly, and obtained a verdict. But the Chief Justice refused to give judgment without the King's direction, because Bishop O'Sullivan *threatened to excommunicate him* if he did. The King, thereupon, issued a writ, commanding the Chief Justice to give judgment, and amerce the Bishop of Cloyne, and to imprison him for further prosecuting the suit in the spiritual courts and for his contempt."—Brady's *Clerical and Parochial Records of Cork, Cloyne and Ross,* iii. 93.

A controversy which took place in the beginning of the reign of Henry III. between the Archbishop of Dublin and FitzAdam, the keeper of the king's forests in Ireland, may give us some idea of the arbitrary manner in which the Church employed the weapons of its spiritual armoury. A poacher had been arrested, and thrown into jail by FitzAdam, because the gamekeepers had found in his house a bow and bloody arrow with the hide and antlers of a newly-killed deer.[1] The Archbishop demanded the release of the prisoner, declared that he was seized illegally on church land, and claimed the forest with its deer as the property of the See of Dublin. This poacher was, it appears, a notorious offender; but when FitzAdam refused to give him up without a pledge that he would stand his trial in the king's court, he brought down upon himself a sentence of excommunication.[2] The royal functionary was, in consequence, legally incapacitated for performing the duties of his office; and thus, at least for a time, the Primate obtained a decided advantage. The litigation was at length brought to a close by the appointment of a Commission to inquire into the respective rights of the Crown and the archbishop.

Another case, in which the people of Dublin were concerned, illustrates still more clearly the difficulty of resisting the encroachments of the Church. The mayor and citizens, in A.D. 1267, had made a regulation tending to reduce certain fees paid to the clergy under the name of "Oblations of the Faithful:" but the Archbishop denounced the arrangement, excommunicated those who had concurred in it, and placed the city under an interdict. The Cardinal Octobon—the

---

[1] Gilbert's *Viceroys of Ireland*, p. 86.

[2] "By our common law," says Hallam, "an excommunicated person is incapable of being a witness, or of bringing an action; and he may be detained in prison until he obtains absolution. . . . They were to be shunned, like men infected with leprosy, by their servants, their friends and their families. . . . Indeed the mere intercourse with a proscribed [excommunicated] person incurred what was called the lesser excommunication, or privation of the sacraments, and required penitence and absolution."—*Middle Ages*, ii. 171-2. London, 1855. Down to the last century it was, in many parts of Italy, held as orthodox doctrine that *to murder an excommunicated Catholic was not a sin.* See *Columbanus ad Hibernos.* No. vii. Introductory letter iii., *note.*

Pope's Legate, who happened to be in England at the time—confirmed the awful malediction. Public worship was accordingly suspended; the dying were deprived of the rites of the Church; and the dead were denied Christian burial. The Privy Council was soon obliged to interfere, and the dispute terminated in a compromise. It was agreed that, when a citizen committed a public sin, he should, for the first offence, commute, or make satisfaction, by payment of a sum of money; that, in case of a second transgression, he should be cudgelled about the church; that a third transgression should subject him to a public cudgelling, attended by a procession; and that, if he still proved incorrigible, he should be either turned out of the city or cudgelled through it.[1] It was further agreed that a general inquisition for public sins should be made annually. This "general inquisition," with its accompanying commutations, was obviously designed to add to the clerical endowments; and the laity seem to have submitted to these repeated cudgellings as a mode of penance—doubtless not very agreeable—but not likely to reduce them to poverty.

The contests between the civil and spiritual courts were kept up with great pertinacity on both sides throughout the whole of the thirteenth century. The Pope, in various ways, encouraged the ecclesiastical tribunals to carry on the struggle—as he was aware that their success was in reality his own. The King, supported by his nobles, was anxious to maintain his princely power in its integrity; the Church endeavoured to circumscribe and cripple it, so as virtually to strip him of his sovereignty. In the year 1291, Nicholas MacMaelisa, Archbishop of Armagh, a man of great ability and resolution, inaugurated a Church Defence Association of a very formidable character. The members of this confederacy—which was intended to include all the archbishops, bishops, deans and chapters, and others of the clergy—bound themselves under the sanction of an oath,[2] to resist, at the common expense, in proportion to their respective incomes, all attempts

[1] Harris's *Ware*, i. 322-3. Archbishops of Dublin, Fulk de Saunford, A.D. 1256, 1271.

[2] Various forms of adjuration formerly prevailed in Ireland. In A.D. 1470 we find a bishop of Down and Connor taking the oath of obedience to his metropolitan

to interfere with the rights, liberties, or customs of their churches, by any lay power or jurisdiction. Should any of their officials sustain any loss or injury when defending them against the civil courts, they pledged themselves to make compensation according to a rateable proportion of their revenues. Any sentence of excommunication, pronounced by a bishop on any one who stood in the way of their association, was to be published by the other prelates in their dioceses; so that any place in which the offender might seek refuge could be put under an interdict. Should any bishop or archbishop prove negligent in acting up to the articles of the confederacy, he was to forfeit a heavy fine to the Pope, and a like amount to his brother bishops and archbishops.[1] It does not appear that this association was able to carry out its arrangements; for government must have virtually abnegated its functions, had it tolerated any such combination.[2]

The mode in which ecclesiastical patronage was administered had already created no little scandal; and year after year the complaints relating to it became louder and more general. In the beginning of the reign of Henry III., the English government instructed the Viceroy to prohibit the admission of any Irishman to cathedral preferment in his own country:[3] but the order gave so much dissatisfaction that it was subsequently cancelled. The Pope himself interposed, and insisted on the withdrawal of a regulation so invidious.[4] But though

---

in a somewhat peculiar manner. "There is something observable," says Ware, "in the form of administering the oath. For it was done *manu ad cor appositâ, et inspectis SS Dei Evangeliis*, laying his hand on his heart, and looking on the gospel; and not laying his hand on the gospel *as is now practised.*"—*Ware*, i. 204. It would appear from this that a change has taken place even since the days of Ware.

[1] *Ware's Bishops*, by Harris. Archbishops of Armagh. Nicholas MacMaelisa was Archbishop from A.D. 1272 to A.D. 1303. *Ware*, i. 69. Dublin, 1764. A copy of the articles of this confederation may be found in King's *Primer*. Supplementary vol. pp. 1114, 1118.

[2] "In the next year we find the Bishop of Cork fined; and in the year 1297 the Bishop of Down, for exercising pleas belonging to the crown, as was said, had been fined; and the illustrious Archbishop himself (MacMaelisa) was visited with a mulct, to which he had to submit."—MALONE, p. 217.

[3] Gilbert's *Viceroys of Ireland*, p. 80.

[4] A letter on this subject to his Legate in Ireland, dated August, A.D. 1220, may be found in *Theiner*, p. 16.

the Roman high priest was sensible of the imprudence of professing to act on such a principle, he had no objection to see foreigners quietly obtaining possession of the best livings in the Irish Church; and he was prepared to use his influence for the advancement of Italians to its abbacies and bishoprics.[1] The number of these Ultramontanes presented to Irish benefices led to the most vehement remonstrances; and the evil was all the more intolerable, as, in many cases, the strangers were mere sinecurists, who performed no duty, and who did not even reside in the land which they impoverished by their exactions.[2] In a letter addressed by Henry III. to the Chief Governor of Ireland, the King directs that the Pope's agents must not be permitted so shamefully to abuse their patronage.[3] This admonition seems to have been dictated by the jealousy of English churchmen, who were often disappointed by these Italian nominations. They had, however, little cause to murmur; for they enjoyed a large proportion of the most lucrative appointments. Men deemed unworthy of advancement in Great Britain repaired to Ireland;[4] and managed by intrigues or flattery, or still baser appliances, to obtain ecclesiastical promotion. The native Irish clergy, deeply aggrieved by the mode in which livings were distributed, at last determined to take steps for the protection of their own interests. At a meeting held about the middle of the thirteenth century,[5] they resolved that no man of the English nation should be admitted as a canon into any of the Irish churches. This display of nationality alarmed King Henry, and led him to apply for aid to Rome. The

---

[1] Thus, in A.D. 1247, Reiner, or Reginald, a Dominican Friar and an Italian, was made Archbishop of Armagh. He held the See nine years, but he spent the one third of this time in Rome, and died there in A.D. 1256. Walter de Salerno, another Italian, who was made Archbishop of Tuam in A.D. 1257, never visited his diocese. John, another Italian, who became Bishop of Clonfert in A.D. 1266, was subsequently made Archbishop of Benevento. See *Ware's Bishops*, by Harris; O'Conor's *Historical Address*, part i. p. 130; and *Annals of the Four Masters*, at A.D. 1267. See also *Theiner*, p. 49.

[2] Leland, i. 233.

[3] Leland, *Ibid.*

[4] Leland, i. 234. These Englishmen could not speak the language of the country, so that they were totally unqualified to minister to the people.

[5] Probably in A.D. 1250. See Leland, i. 235.

Pope, in a bull addressed to the discontented bishops and chapters, condemned their proceedings, on the ground that they were dictated by prejudice and envy, and that they indicated a design to establish hereditary right in God's sanctuary. At the same time he required them forthwith to rescind their resolution.[1] The malcontents had no other alternative but to submit to this peremptory mandate.

The Pope enjoyed special advantages when dealing with a weak State: and the condition of the English power in Ireland supplied him with peculiar facilities for the augmentation of his influence. When parties were struggling with each other, he was permitted to act as mediator; and, by adroitly making use of that position, he contrived to obtain their mutual consent to his own aggrandisement. We may be at a loss to discover any well-defined principle of equity by which he regulated his decisions; he sided sometimes with the native clergy, sometimes with the English settlers, sometimes with the Irish laity, and sometimes with the English sovereign; but he always kept steadily in view the maintenance or enlargement of his own authority. In consequence of the feeble state of the executive government, it much required his aid; by sustaining it with his excommunications and interdicts, he frequently laid it under weighty obligations: it requited him by sanctioning his ordinances and winking at his usurpations; and thus it was that his demands secured an amount of deference in Ireland which they did not receive in the sister kingdom. Contributions, which he could not levy in England, were here paid into his treasury by a poor and down-trodden people.[2] In addition to his annual revenues, he obtained extraordinary assessments on four memorable occasions during the thirteenth century, viz., in 1229, 1240, 1247, and 1270. Three of these assessments were levied to enable him to carry on war against the Emperor of Germany; and the fourth, to assist him in contending against the King

[1] The Bull may be found in the *Liber Munerum Publicorum Hiberniæ*, part iv., 55-6.

[2] Brenan and others ascribe the compliance of the Irish to "their attachment to the Holy See." It obviously proceeded from their helplessness.

of Arragon.[1] Nor were these the only cases in which the country suffered from Italian cupidity. Those who laid violent hands on the clergy could not obtain absolution except from a legate[2] charged with that special commission; and such a messenger seldom left the island without a very substantial addition to his wealth. Jacobus, who arrived in 1220 or 1221, and who was sent, according to the annalists, "to regulate and constitute the ecclesiastical discipline," is said to have "collected horse-loads of gold and silver from the clergy of Ireland by simony."[3] The patience with which the people submitted to such bare-faced rapacity supplies evidence, as well of their spiritual, as of their political degradation. To satisfy the demands of these greedy foreigners, the ecclesiastics were sometimes obliged to sell the ornaments of their churches; and the laity were compelled to deprive themselves of their ordinary comforts.[4]

During the thirteenth century the system of indulgences appears to have been extremely popular in Ireland. It was quite unknown in early times; but it was one of those abuses which crept into the Church along with other superstitions. The laws of penitential discipline had become very precise; an ecclesiastical tariff declared the number of days' penance due to various transgressions; and indulgences relieved offenders from these irksome satisfactions. By some achievement, deemed specially praiseworthy, the sinner earned an indulgence—that is, he escaped the fastings or macerations which he must have otherwise undergone. An indulgence for so many days was simply an exemption from so many days' penance.[5] The Pope at this time claimed the granting of indulgences as his peculiar privilege; but he occasionally gave power to bishops to dispense them on certain conditions. Rich transgressors could obtain them

[1] Mant, i. 13; Cox, 61, 65, 66, 71. [2] Leland, i. 233.

[3] *Annals of Clonmacnois.* O'Donovan's *Four Masters*, iii. 199, *note.*

[4] Cox, p. 61.

[5] According to modern Romanists, "the benefit of indulgences consists not only in the remission of canonical penance, *but also of the temporal punishment due to the divine justice.*" See Husenbeth's *Life of Bishop Milner*, p. 501. Dublin, 1862. It would appear from this that indulgences propose to grant security against such evils as sickness and poverty.

without difficulty; for, by generous donations, they could escape a vast amount of bodily endurance. They were offered to those who went on pilgrimages; and, when the same high place of devotion had a great variety of sacred spots, a visit to each was reckoned meritorious—so that a single journey sometimes obliterated a heavy penitential reckoning. In 1237, Christian, Bishop of Emly, granted twenty days' indulgence to those who contributed to the building of St. Paul's Church, London.[1] In 1262, Thomas McFerall, Bishop of Elphin, gave fifty days' indulgence to those who repaired to the chapel of the Virgin Mary in the Temple of London; and forty days more to those who visited a certain tomb in the same neighbourhood.[2] About 1280, Stephen of Folburn,[3] Bishop of Waterford, granted forty days' indulgence to those who went on pilgrimage to the Abbey of Glastonbury; ten days to those who visited the relics; twenty days to those who visited the cross; and ten days to those who visited a sapphire stone preserved there, which was supposed to possess preternatural virtue.[4] In 1289, Richard Cor, Bishop of Lismore, granted forty days' indulgence to any person who should hear mass from any canon of Christ Church, Dublin, or should say the Lord's Prayer, or an Ave Maria, for the benefactors of that church.[5] When we remember that the most eminent prelates sanctioned these silly superstitions, we may form some idea of the deep spiritual ignorance which prevailed. Those who submitted to penance as a means of reconciliation with God, or who sought relief by an indulgence, could not have rightly understood the doctrine of a free salvation by faith in the great Atoning Sacrifice.

The veneration of relics is unquestionably one of the most puerile forms of superstition. The body, as well as the soul of the believer, has been redeemed by Christ; but it is mean-

---

[1] Mant's *History of the Church of Ireland*, i. 91.

[2] *Ibid*, i. 92.

[3] He was a native of Folburn in Cambridgeshire. He acted as treasurer of Ireland, and subsequently as Lord Justice. In 1286 he was appointed Archbishop of Tuam. Cotton's *Fasti*, i. 118.

[4] Mant, i. 92.

[5] Mant, i. 92-93.

while doomed to corruption; and, when stricken down by death, it is to be decently committed to the grave. When the Father of the Faithful lost the wife of his youth, he wept bitterly as he gazed on the remains of one whom he had loved so tenderly: and yet he acted as a good and wise man when "he stood up from before his dead, and spake unto the sons of Heth, saying, Give me a possession of a burying-place with you, *that I may bury my dead out of my sight.*"[1] But long before this period it was currently believed that marvellous virtue often resided in dead bodies; the bones of reputed saints were disentombed and exhibited by the monks and clergy; and every church was deemed eminently holy which possessed some such treasures. The Crusades greatly promoted the worship of relics. Many of those who returned from Palestine brought home with them memorials of their own credulity which they had purchased from the crafty Easterns, and which consisted of toes, or fingers, or teeth, or skulls, said, on very questionable evidence, to have belonged to evangelists or martyrs. The wonderful regard paid to such things by the people of Ireland in the thirteenth century supplies a melancholy index of their spiritual condition. The new orders of monks settled in the country were the chief retailers of the "old wives' fables" which fostered the delusion. The ignorant crowd listened with astonishment and awe as the friars repeated tale after tale, illustrating the miraculous power of rags and skeletons. The annalists record, as one of the notable events of the age, how, in A.D. 1242, "a great chapter was held by the Primate of Armagh, and by the abbots of the canons (regular) of Ireland at Louth, on which occasion were exhibited the relics which St. Moctheus had brought from Rome."[2] Mochta, or Moctheus, is reported to have flourished towards the close of the fifth and beginning of the sixth century.[3] He was, perhaps, the founder of the monastery of Louth; but it is extremely improbable that he

[1] Gen. xxiii. 3, 4.

[2] *The Four Masters*, by Connellan, p. 61.

[3] He is said to have been by birth a Briton, and to have died, at the age of 100, in A.D. 535. See Lanigan i. 308, 347. According to some, he was the last survivor of the disciples of Patrick. Lanigan, 494.

had ever been in Rome, or that he had brought any relics from that city. The whole aspect of this transaction is suspicious ; for Albert of Cologne,[1] the Primate of Armagh—who presided at the exhibition of these ecclesiastical antiquities—meditated the annexation of the parish of Louth,[2] and several rural deaneries in the same district, to his diocese. This project was soon afterwards carried into execution. By endorsing the claims of these ghostly trophies, and thus exalting the credit of the abbey of Louth, he aimed to acquire influence with the monks and clergy of the neighbourhood, that he might with less difficulty accomplish his design.

At this period the multitude were prepared to believe the most stupid fabrications where the honour of relics was concerned. The very few who may have been disposed to sift the evidence submitted to them, must have found abundant cause for scepticism. It was announced that a special revelation had led to the discovery of the veritable bones of Patrick, Brigid, and Columbkille—the three great saints of Ireland ; but, had any spirit of inquiry been abroad, this tale, gravely reported and currently believed, might rather have awakened universal ridicule. Nearly five hundred years before, it was stated, in the *Book of Armagh*, that the body of Patrick was like the body of Moses, as no one could tell where it was buried.[4] Tradition, no doubt, named Downpatrick, or the neighbourhood, as the place of its sepulture ; but the exact spot was confessedly unknown. Various doubts existed relative to the locality originally honoured as the grave of Brigid ;[5] but before the middle of the ninth century her supposed remains had been removed to the capital of Ulidia;

[1] Albert, who was by birth a German, was made Archbishop of Armagh by papal influence. He was a great stickler for papal pretensions. See Harris's *Ware*. "Archbishops of Armagh."

[2] We read of a Bishop of Louth in the eleventh century. See Harris's *Ware*. i. p. 182. He was evidently originally a parochial bishop, as the rural deaneries of Drogheda, Ardee, and Dundalk, now added to the diocese of Armagh, had also been bishoprics. See Ware's *Bishops of Clogher*, by Harris. David O'Brogan, A.D. 1240 to A.D. 1267.

[3] The annexation took place not long after the time of the exhibition of the relics.

[4] See Book I., Chap. IV. *note*, p. 73. [5] See Lanigan, iv. 456-7.

and not long afterwards the bones of Columbkille were transferred from Iona to the same resting-place.[1] In the course of three hundred years no one could tell where these relics were buried; and immediately after the English invasion—when a new impulse was given to the march of will-worship—many began to regret that they could not point out the holy ground. Malachy the Third, the Bishop of Down, especially desired the information. Could he obtain it, he was sure to reap a rich harvest of reputation and of wealth—for the place would forthwith become famous; multitudes of pilgrims would resort to it; and costly oblations would be presented at its shrine. A rumour at length spread abroad to the effect that, in answer to prayer, the mystery had been solved.[2] One night, it was said, as Malachy was worshipping in the Cathedral, a light like a sunbeam, which traversed the church and stopped at a particular spot, attracted his attention. The thought immediately occurred to him that the bodies were buried there; and when he dug into the earth he came upon the bones of three human skeletons. The discovery was communicated without delay to John de Courcy, then lord of the territory; and was deemed of such importance that it was announced, by special messengers, to Urban III., the reigning Pontiff.[3] A grand demonstration followed. Cardinal Vivian, who had been at Down nine years before,[4] and who had left behind him such an unhappy reputation for rapacity, was now sent all the way from Rome to superintend the solemnities. The relics were removed to a more honourable position in the Church. Fifteen bishops, including the Primate, Thomas O'Conor of Armagh,[5] with a crowd of abbots, deans, archdeacons, and others, were present at their translation; and it was resolved that the anniversary of this memorable day should henceforward be celebrated as a

---

[1] See Book I., Chap. VI., *note* (3), p. 148.

[2] This pretended discovery took place in the time of Giraldus Cambrensis, who tells us that Patrick was found lying in the middle, with Brigid on one side and Columbkille on the other. *Topographia Hibernica.* Distin. iii., cap. 18.

[3] Lanigan iv. 275. Urban was Pope from A.D. 1184 to A.D. 1187.

[4] See Book II., Chap. II., p. 232.

[5] Connellan's *Four Masters,* p. 96, *note.*

festival all over Ireland. The well-known distich still commemorates the event :

> Hi tres in Duno tumulo tumulantur in uno,
> Brigida, Patricius, atque Columba pius.[1]

The conflicting stories afloat respecting the objects now regarded with such reverence, might well have disturbed the credulity of those who placed confidence in relics ; and the statements relative to the body of Patrick were peculiarly bewildering. About a year before the ceremonial in which the Primate, the bishop of Down, and Cardinal Vivian figured so conspicuously, it was affirmed that an angel had pointed out the remains of the apostle of Ireland at the abbey of Glastonbury.[2] According to another announcement, made upwards of a century afterwards, the bones of the three human skeletons, dug up in the cathedral of Down, could not have belonged to Patrick, Brigid, and Columbkille. Though treated with such distinguished honour by a splendid assembly of Irish prelates and dignitaries, headed by a Roman Cardinal, there seems to have been no evidence to prove that they were not the remains of three pagans, or of three malefactors. The Irish annals inform us that, in A.D. 1293, "it was revealed to Nicholas MacMaelisa (Archbishop of Armagh) that the relics of Patrick, Columbkille, and Brigid, were at Saul,"[3] about two miles distant from Downpatrick. The record goes on to say that the Primate took up what bones were found in the place indicated, and that "great miracles and wonders were afterwards wrought by them."[4] It is pretty obvious that these two discoveries of the same relics in different places were pious frauds. "The discovery of them at Down in A.D. 1195," says a candid Roman Catholic antiquary, "was a scheme of Sir John de Courcy and his writers ; and their discovery at Saul in 1293 was a

---

[1] Thus translated by an old chronicler :—

> "In Down three saints one tomb do fill—
> Patrick, Bridget and Columbkille."

[2] O'Donovan's *Four Masters*, iii. 457.

[3] *Annals of the Four Masters*, at A.D. 1293.

[4] See Connellan's *Four Masters*, p. 96.

counter-scheme of Nicholas MacMaelisa, who was one of the greatest opposers of the English that ever governed the See of Armagh."[1] How low must have been the tone of morality when men of the highest position in the Church were prepared to lend their sanction to such miserable dodgery!

During this period of degeneracy Ireland produced a few writers of reputation. Among these may be mentioned the anonymous authors of the *Annals of Inisfallen*[2] and *Multifernan*.[3] John a Sacro Bosco, or John of Holywood,[4] was distinguished as a philosopher and mathematician. Peter, surnamed Hibernicus, an Irishman who settled at Naples about A.D. 1240, is said to have been the teacher of the celebrated Thomas Aquinas.[5] Gotofrid, a native of Waterford, was famous as a linguist; and at a time when such acquirements were rare, signalized himself by his knowledge, not only of Greek and Latin, but also of French, Hebrew, and Arabic.[6] So great was his thirst for information, that he travelled to Asia Minor, Palestine, and Syria, and spent many years there in the study of Eastern literature. Thomas Palmer, or Palmerston, usually styled Thomas Hibernicus, was another eminent literary Irishman. Leaving his own country in early life, he removed to Paris, where he became a Doctor of the Sorbonne.[7] He subsequently settled in Italy, and died there about the close of the thirteenth century.[8] He was the author of a large

---

[1] O'Donovan's *Annals of the Four Masters*, iii. 458, *note*. See also Haverty, p. 274. Nicholas Le Blund, who was now Bishop of Down, seems to have been an Englishman or Norman: and this fact probably embittered the jealousy of his Irish namesake.

[2] Inisfallen is a small island in the lakes of Killarney. The monastery is said to have been founded by Finian in the sixth century. The *Annals* have been brought down to A.D. 1320.

[3] Multifernan is in the diocese of Meath. These *Annals*, edited by Dr. Aquila Smith, are among the publications of the Irish Archæological Society. Much obscurity hangs around the question of their authorship.

[4] Either Holywood, near Belfast, or, as others maintain, Holywood in Co. Dublin. See Harris's *Co. Down*, p. 260.

[5] Brenan, pp 318-9.

[6] Brenan, p. 318.

[7] The Sorbonne was the great French school of theology connected with the University of Paris. It was established about A.D. 1250, and was so called from Robert de Sorbonne, its founder.

[8] Brenan, p. 320.

number of learned works. But by far the most noted of the *literati* who flourished during this period, and who are claimed by Ireland, was John Duns Scotus, a Franciscan monk of wonderful subtlety and eloquence.[1] The place of his birth has been very much disputed. According to some he was an Englishman; according to others a Scotchman; but there are good grounds for believing that he was born in county Down, and that he was a native of the barony of Lecale.[2] He studied, first in a Franciscan monastery, and afterwards at Oxford, where he soon attained the highest distinction. He subsequently removed to Paris; and in A.D. 1308 died at Cologne, when he had reached the age of only thirty-four years. He is particularly known as the great champion of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of Mary, the mother of our Lord. Before his time this doctrine had been explicitly denied by many of the most eminent doctors of the Church—including Augustine, Bernard, Peter Lombard, and Thomas Aquinas;[3] but Duns Scotus devoted all his powers to its vindication, and added greatly to its popularity.

Almost all the literary Irishmen of whom we read during the period before us, spent much of their lives abroad. In their native land a superior education could no longer be obtained. They were obliged to go to England, or France, or Italy, to complete their studies. As they could expect no adequate encouragement at home, they never returned to Ireland. They acquired their fame after they had left it, and they died in foreign countries.

Early in the fourteenth century the Bishop of Rome

---

[1] He was born in A.D. 1274, the year in which Thomas Aquinas, the great doctor of the Dominicans, died.

[2] See Wadding's *Annales Min. Fratr.*, tom. vi. See also an article in Duffy's *Irish Catholic Magazine* for June, 1847, pp. 129, 132. St. Patrick and St. Francis were recognised by Scotus as his patron saints. Maurice O'Fihely or De Portu, an Irishman and a Franciscan, who commented on some of his works, and who died Archbishop of Tuam in A.D. 1513, speaks of Duns Scotus as his countryman. See *Joannis Duns Scoti Opera Omnia*, tom. i., vita p. 3. Lugduni, 1639. It appears that, even in the time of O'Fihely, Ireland was sometimes called Scotia Major. *Ibid*, tom. i. p. 499.

[3] See Preuss *On the Immaculate Conception*, pp. 16, 18, 22, 23, 27. Edinburgh, 1867.

removed his residence to Avignon, where his court remained about seventy years.[1] This step considerably lowered his prestige; and was particularly disagreeable to the inhabitants of the States of the Church, who were accustomed to designate his long absence from Italy his Babylonish captivity.[2] During its continuance the sovereign Pontiffs were the mere vassals of the French monarch; and the conclave of cardinals was ruled by the same influence. Clement V., who inaugurated the change of residence, was obliged to suppress the Knights Templars to gratify his Gallic master.[3] These military monks—whose wealth seems to have excited the cupidity of Philip the Fair—were put down in Ireland, as well as in other parts of Europe. The mean subserviency with which the Pope submitted to their ruin is acknowledged even by Roman Catholic historians. The writ for their suppression in this country was issued by Edward II. in 1307, the first year of his reign; and some time afterwards the Templars all over the island were arrested, conducted to Dublin, and imprisoned in the Castle. Their trial was little better than a mockery of the forms of justice; for the charges against them were supported by most unsatisfactory evidence; but they were condemned, and their property confiscated. The Pope granted their possessions throughout the kingdom to the Hospitallers; and Edward II. subsequently confirmed the donation. Though their treatment was very harsh, they are said to have experienced less severity in Ireland than in most other countries.[4]

---

[1] From A.D. 1305 to A.D. 1376. [2] Reid's *Mosheim*, p. 492.

[3] This order was instituted in the time of the Crusades. It was so called because the house in which the knights originally resided was near the site of the temple of Jerusalem. The knights undertook to defend Christianity by force of arms, and especially to protect pilgrims on their way to the Holy Land.

[4] Gilbert's *Viceroys*, p. 125.

CHAPTER IV.

FROM THE DEATH OF EDWARD I. TO THE DEPOSITION OF RICHARD II.[1] A.D. 1307 TO A.D. 1399.

IN the early part of the fourteenth century the social state of Ireland was most unsatisfactory. After one hundred and thirty years' experience of English sovereignty, the people still submitted impatiently to the yoke. Little care was taken to win them over to more cordial obedience. Those who belonged to the English settlements—or what was subsequently called the Pale—were subject to the provisions of the British statute-book; whilst almost all the rest of the inhabitants[2] remained under the old Brehon law. There was always a border territory of undefined extent, where neither English nor native rule decisively predominated; where lawlessness was the order of the day; and where the people lived in a wretched condition. The natives within the Pale did not enjoy the privileges of English or Anglo-Irish residents: they were regarded as an inferior class of human beings; and received the harshest and most unjust treatment. They were robbed of their cattle, but they could obtain no redress; they were stripped of their lands on the most frivolous pretences;

[1] Edward II. A.D. 1307 to A.D. 1327; Edward III. A.D. 1327 to A.D. 1377; Richard II. A.D. 1377 to A.D. 1399.

[2] There were five families of the Irish, viz: the O'Melaghlins, the O'Neills, the O'Conors, the O'Briens, and the McMurroughs (Cavanaghs)—called "the five bloods"—entitled to the coveted distinction of the advantage of the English laws. See Sir John Davys' *Historical Relations*, p. 23. Dublin, 1704. It was to these five septs that the old royal families of Ireland belonged. Hallam's *Const. Hist. of England*, p. 837. Ed. London, 1870.

and an Englishman could kill an Irishman with impunity.[1] In the reign of Edward I. these natives, again and again, petitioned government for admission to the enjoyment of the laws of England; and offered the king a large sum of money for the privilege; but the British settlers, aware that such a concession would curb their rapacity and violence, contrived to defeat the application.[2] Without the vision of a seer the consequences might have been predicted. The aborigines deeply resented their cruel oppression; the estrangement between them and the colonists increased; and it became more and more difficult to maintain the authority of the English monarch. When Robert Bruce appeared as the deliverer of Scotland, and when on the memorable 24th of June, 1314, he secured its independence by the glorious victory of Bannockburn, the Irish began to take courage. They invited the Scottish hero to interfere in their defence; Robert induced his brother Edward to respond to their appeal; and, accordingly, in May 1315, this brave soldier landed with six thousand men at Larne on the coast of Antrim.[3] Joined by the natives in great numbers, he soon overran a large portion of the country, and was crowned King of Ireland. For upwards of three years he maintained his ground against all opposition; but famine at length began to make terrible ravages among his troops; the ablest English generals encountered him in the field; and, in October, 1318, he sustained a complete defeat near Dundalk, and lost his life in the

---

[1] See King's *Primer*, ii. 638.

[2] Leland, i. 243-247. "The great Anglo-Irish lords had a direct interest in excluding their Irish tenants from the protection of the English law. Over their English tenants they could legally exercise no powers but such as were exercised in England; but over their Irish tenants they claimed, and were legally entitled to, all the privileges which had been exercised by the Irish princes." *Note to Grace's Annals*, p. 84. Irish Archæol. Soc. Publications.

[3] See Reeves's *Antiq. of Down, Connor, and Dromore*, pp. 265, 271. King Robert Bruce himself came to Ireland when his brother was in the country, but remained only for a short period. The appearance of Edward Bruce in Ireland seems to have been hailed with delight by the bulk of the native population. Clyn says that "during the whole time the Scots were in Ireland, *almost all the Irish of the land adhered*, very few preserving faith and fidelity to the English crown." But the horrors of the war seem to have at length made them weary of Bruce's presence, and hence the annalists speak of his death with so much satisfaction.

engagement. This overthrow extinguished the Scottish power in Ireland.

Though Edward Bruce appeared among the men of Ulster at their own request to liberate them from horrid oppression, and though many of the native clergy, and even some of the bishops, gave him their support,[1] the Pope fulminated excommunications against both himself and all his adherents. This step seems to have been anticipated by the northern chieftains; and one of the most remarkable documents of the period is a petition addressed to John XXII., the reigning Pontiff, by King Donald O'Neill,[2] in the name of the nobles and people of Ireland. This memorial sets forth the miseries of the country, and states the reasons which had induced so many of the aboriginal inhabitants to join the standard of their Scottish emancipator. After referring to the legendary history of the island, and to the Bull of Adrian making it over to the British crown, the petition goes on indignantly to describe the gross injustice which the natives had recently experienced.[3] It declares that the conditions calculated to promote the improvement of the native population, as mentioned in the papal grant, had never been fulfilled; and that the English had ever since endeavoured, with all their power, to exterminate the Irish inhabitants. "By means of base and iniquitous scheming," says this appeal, "they have so far prevailed against us that, after expelling us violently, without regard to the authority of any superior, from our spacious habitations and patrimonial inheritances, they have forced us to retire, for the preservation of life, to mountains, woods, bogs, and barren moors, and even to the caves of the rocks;

---

[1] Leland, i. 271, 275. Adam de Northampton, bishop of Ferns, was one of the adherents of Bruce. Gilbert's *Viceroys of Ireland*, p. 140. The Irish state, in their appeal to John XXII., that they were prepared to verify their recital of outrages "by the testimony of *twelve bishops at least*." Most of these were probably sympathisers. The document itself was evidently written by an ecclesiastic.

[2] O'Neill styles himself "King of Ulster and true heir to the throne of all Ireland by hereditary right." From the English invasion to this period the power of the O'Neills had been declining in Ulster; but it now acquired fresh strength, and continued to flourish till the beginning of the seventeenth century.

[3] This letter is given at length in King's *Primer*. Supplementary volume. 1119-1135. The original may be found in Fordun's *Scotichronicon*, at A.D. 1318.

and there, like wild beasts, to dwell for a long period. Nay, even there they are incessantly molesting us, and exerting themselves with all their might to drive us away; and recklessly seizing, for their own use, on every spot where we reside, they mendaciously assert, in the extreme frenzy which blinds them, that we have no claim to any free dwelling-place in Ireland; but that, of right, the whole property of the country belongs to themselves. Because of these and many other things of the same description, there have arisen between us and them implacable enmities and perpetual wars. . . . From the period when the grant [of Adrian] was issued to the present time, more than fifty thousand people of both nations have perished by the sword, besides those who have fallen victims to famine, to grief, and to the rigours of captivity. These few circumstances relative to the general history of our forefathers, and the miserable condition to which the Pope of Rome has reduced ourselves, may suffice for this occasion."[1]

In this memorial special mention is made by the petitioners of the barefaced partiality shown to persons of English descent in the civil courts. Every man who was not Irish might, they assert, on any pretence, go to law with an Irishman; whilst, with the exception of the prelates, neither layman nor ecclesiastic, who was Irish, could commence any action whatever. If an Englishman killed an Irishman—no matter of what rank, whether he were clergyman or layman, secular or regular—were he even a bishop—there was no punishment awarded for the murderer by the English judge. Monks of the English race had been known to declare that it was no more sin to kill an Irishman than to kill a dog; and that, if they committed such an act, they would not, on that account, refrain, for a single day, from the celebration of mass. If an Irish female of any rank, married an Englishman, she lost her right of inheritance on the death of her husband. The memorial adds that, in the part of Ireland of which the English were in peaceful possession, religious communities were prohibited from admitting among them any who were

[1] "Haec pauca de generali progenitorum nostrorum origine, et miserabili in quo Romanus Pontifex statu nos posuit, sufficiant ista vice."

not natives of England, under the penalty of being treated by the British sovereign as contemners of his orders. Towards the close of the document a statement is made from which it appears plainly that the petitioners repudiated the right of the Bishop of Rome to dispose of the sovereignty of their island. After enumerating the reasons which had induced them to seek the aid of Edward Bruce, they add :—"Seeing it is freely allowed for every person to renounce his right and make it over to another, *the whole right in the said kingdom* [*of Ireland*] *which is known to pertain to us as its true inheritors*, we have by our letters patent given and granted to the said [Edward Bruce], and for the establishment of judgment, justice, and equity in the land, which, for default of a proper supreme authority, have utterly failed therein, *we have constituted him our king and lord, and appointed him ruler by unanimous consent in our realm aforesaid.*" They conclude by requesting the Pope "mercifully to sanction their proceedings, and to prohibit the King of England from giving them further molestation."

Some writers delight to dwell on the advantages of a Centre of catholic unity. They draw a pleasing picture of the Father of the faithful sitting in the midst of the great family of Christendom, treating all his children with parental kindness, guiding them by his advice, arranging their differences, and enabling them to dwell together in happy fellowship. But when the picture is compared with actual life, the illusion vanishes. As a means of promoting the peace of Christendom, the popedom has proved a melancholy failure. The nations of the West were in the greatest disorder when the Pontiff was at the height of his power. The holy father, clothed with irresponsible authority, was found to be like other men—under the influence of the same infirmities, antipathies, and prejudices; impelled by his passions and his interests; oppressing the weak; crouching to the powerful; and multiplying the confusion which he was expected to remove. Happy had it been for Ireland had it never bowed to the yoke of the See of Rome! Its connection with the Western Patriarchate is a long, dark, and dreary history, exhibiting, on the part of the Pope, treachery, tyranny, and

extortion; and producing, on the part of the people, enslavement, rebellion, sedition, and discontent. The treatment experienced by the Irish patriots in the case of Edward Bruce, was but a continuation of the heartless policy inaugurated by the bull of Adrian IV.

The Pontiff must have been somewhat perplexed when he received the Irish memorial. The petitioners justified their adherence to the standard of Bruce by reasons which he should have felt to be unanswerable. How did he treat their communication? He did not condescend to vouchsafe any direct reply. But he transmitted the appeal to the King of England along with a copy of the bull of Adrian, and reminded him that the conditions prescribed in the papal deed of donation had not been observed. At the same time he begged the British monarch "to take these matters into his calm and deliberate consideration, to confer upon them with his discreet council, and thus proceed to command and enforce a just and speedy correction and reform, by such ways and means as might be proper."[1] He made no apology to the Irish for his bulls of excommunication.[2] He did not acknowledge that he had himself acted ignorantly, or rashly, or wickedly, when he had consigned them all to perdition. They had been goaded to take up arms by the instinct of self-preservation; they were fighting in the hope of obtaining liberation from an intolerable tyranny; they were marshalled under the banners of a prince who professed as much respect for religion as the English themselves;[3] and the Pope had no right to range himself on the side of their oppressors, and to curse them when they were bravely struggling for freedom. He speaks of their wrongs in a style of affected commiseration: but his letter to the English sovereign is transparently

[1] The whole letter may be found in King's *Primer*. Supplementary vol., pp. 1136-39. See the original in *Theiner*, p. 201. It is dated 30th May, 1318. See also O'Sullivan's *Compendium*, lib. i. c. 9.

[2] One of these Bulls, dated April, 1317, and addressed to the Archbishops of Dublin and Cashel and the Dean of Dublin, may be found in Theiner, p. 194. See also Rymer's *Foedera*, at A.D. 1317.

[3] The Irish state in their appeal to the Pope that it was the intention of Bruce to endow the Church "with greater immunities than she had ever, at any former period, been accustomed to enjoy."

deficient in sincerity and earnestness. It no doubt tells his royal correspondent of his obligations to the See of Rome, and it is well fitted to maintain pontifical pretensions; but it contains no threat of excommunication; and his exhortations to improvement are mingled with so many compliments to his "most dearly beloved son in Christ, Edward, the illustrious King of England," and delivered in such honeyed tones of favour, that the British monarch was not likely to be in any way disturbed or intimidated. The Pope's partisans in Ireland adhered steadily to the policy which he had himself already inaugurated; and at the battle near Dundalk, in which Bruce fell, the Archbishop of Armagh went through the ranks of the Anglo-Irish army, distributed his benedictions, and assured of eternal happiness all who should die contending against the Scottish warrior.[1] But though the colonists persevered in their wonted course, and refused to redress the grievances of which the petition complained, the Pope continued to wink at their misconduct. John XXII. was extremely avaricious,[2] and appears during all this time to have been acting under the influence of British gold. Nor did his partiality to Edward II. stop here. In A.D. 1322, when the English King proposed to invade Scotland, John, who professed to be lord paramount of Ireland, gave him permission to levy a heavy tax on the country to assist him in his expedition. The Anglo-Irish clergy, under the pretence that the papal bull authorizing the impost was not forthcoming, stoutly resisted this demand.[3]

Shortly before the close of the struggle in which Bruce was overthrown, the Bishop of Ossory was elevated to the Archbishopric of Cashel; and the Pope, always on the watch for

---

[1] Leland, i. 277. The Archbishop of Armagh at this time was Roland Jorse. See *Ware*, i. 80. He was Archbishop from A.D. 1311 to A.D. 1321. He was obliged in 1321 to resign his place, being "excommunicated for flogging his clergy, pawning his church plate, and repeated acts of incontinence." Brady's *Irish Reformation*. Introd. p. 20; fifth edition. London, 1867.

[2] His wealth at the time of his death amounted to eighteen millions of gold florins in specie, and seven millions in plate and jewels. Milman's *Latin Christianity*, v. 486. He was the son of a cobbler. His pontificate extended from A.D. 1316 to A.D. 1334.

[3] Leland, i. 282.

the advancement of his friends, and ready to anticipate the King in his appointments,[1] promoted a Franciscan friar, named Richard Ledred, to the vacant dignity. Kilkenny, the cathedral town of the Diocese of Ossory, was already a place of some importance; and among its inhabitants were a number of families of wealth and influence. But when the new Bishop took up his abode there, he found himself ill at ease. The resident laity were, it appears, not sufficiently obsequious to churchmen; the pride of Ledred was offended; and he was not well settled in his episcopal chair when, at a meeting of his clergy, he adopted a series of constitutions in which he exhibited his haughty and defiant character. In these ordinances he describes the people around him as "imbued with the devil's spirit," who paid no respect to ecclesiastics, "harassed them in the secular courts, and menaced those who attempted to exercise canonical jurisdiction."[2] One lady—Dame Alice le Kyteler of Kilkenny—provoked his implacable hostility. She had, it is alleged, been four times married; and it may be that her large experience in the way of matrimony, had generated a report that she possessed supernatural powers of fascination. William Outlaw, a son by her first husband, was her special favourite. This William was a rich merchant and money-dealer; and the extent of the transactions in which he was engaged may be estimated by the fact that, on one occasion, when armed men entered his house, they dug up from its concealment a sum of three thousand pounds—equal to sixty thousand pounds of our present currency.[3] His mother—Dame Alice,—who was a partner in his business, evidently possessed superior intelligence. Her name

[1] As the King was so much indebted to the Pope for his support whilst Edward Bruce was in Ireland, he was probably not disposed to object to this usurpation of church patronage. Ledred was consecrated at Avignon by an Italian Bishop. Cotton's *Fasti*, ii. 272. At a later period we find an Archbishop of Cashel compelled, by Edward III., to give an annual pension to a clerk named by him, "as a penalty for having accepted his See from the Pope." Cotton's *Fasti*, i. 9.

[2] Gilbert's *Viceroys*, p. 153. See the constitutions of this Synod in Wilkins's *Concilia*, ii. 501-506. The sixth constitution is directed against clergymen who openly kept concubines. Every offender of this description is threatened with suspension *ab officio*, if *within a month* after notice, he did not dismiss the woman!

[3] See Hallam's *Middle Ages*, ii. 430, 432. London, 1841.

indicates that she was of Norman or French extraction; and it is not improbable that she had, at least to some extent, imbibed the doctrines of Peter Waldo.[1] It is certain that she was charged with the practices absurdly attributed to Waldo's followers. It had been reported of him that he was in league with the devil; his adherents were denounced as sorcerers; they were maliciously nicknamed *scobaces*, or *broomsmen;* and it was gravely affirmed that, mounted on broomsticks, they travelled through the air to their midnight meetings.[2] Dame Alice lay under the same imputations. She had, it seems, some skill in medicine; she perhaps sold drugs to her customers; and she was represented as driving a lucrative trade in charms and philters. Her increasing wealth was ascribed to her alliance with the Prince of Darkness; and there ran a whisper round the place that, in the dusk of the evening, she was wont to sweep the streets, and to mutter to herself as she moved along in the direction of the banker's residence:

"To the house of William, my son,
Hie all the luck of Kilkenny town."

[1] After their dispersion in the southern districts of the country, the Waldense spread themselves over nearly all France. Some of them sought refuge in Picardy. But, towards the end of the twelfth century, Philip Augustus, King of France, expelled them from that district. "He took up arms against the Waldenses of Picardy, pulled down *three hundred houses of gentlemen* who supported their party, destroyed some walled towns, and *drove the inhabitants into Flanders.*"—MILNER'S *History of the Church of Christ*, p. 535. Edinburgh, 1840. Many of these Waldenses were weavers. See *Mosheim*, vol. ii. 509, *note*. Edition by Soames. London, 1841. It is a well-known fact that a colony from Flanders, consisting chiefly of tradesmen, many of whom were engaged in weaving linen and woollen fabrics, settled not long afterwards in Kilkenny. They were located in a village near the castle long distinguished by the name of *Flemingstown*. See *Transactions of the Kilkenny Archæological Society*, i. 39, 1849-51.

[2] In the dark ages grammar and the science of magic were supposed to be nearly allied. Campbell's *Strictures*, p. 234. The ancient Waldenses were charged with "heresy and sorcery." *Proceedings against Dame Alice Kyteler* Introd. p. 5. *Camden Society Publications*. London, 1843. Peter Waldo was said to be in league with the devil. His followers were charged with sorcery, and nick-named *scobaces*, or riders on a *scoba* or broom. *Ibid.* It was said that the devil appeared to them in the form of a cat, and that they were carried through the air to the spot where they held their nightly meetings. *Ibid.* p. 6. It was alleged that they rode on sticks, anointed with a certain ointment, which carried them in a moment to the place of assignation. "We seem to recognise, under these horrible accusations, the persecuted reformers, while few and weak, *hurrying in the darkness to their stolen prayer meetings.*"—*Ibid.* p. 7.

It may be that Dame Alice was in advance of the wild Irish in the knowledge of agriculture. If she ordered her servants to sweep the streets, and if she herself superintended the performance, she may, all the while, have had an eye to business; and she probably designed, by the collection and application of manure, to improve the produce of the meadow-lands which she held in the neighbourhood of the city.[1]

Dame Alice, we have reason to believe, was not happy in her family relations. Her children, by her second and third marriages, looked with envy on the prosperity of William Outlaw; and, as their mother did not deal with them so generously as they desired, they circulated stories to her prejudice. Her fourth husband—who seems to have been a person of sickly temperament—joined in their accusations; and was induced to believe that his attenuated condition was owing to the blighting influences of the witch to whom he was allied. Dame Alice had no great reverence for the hierarchy, and was not much addicted to church-going; for, though holding a high social position among the inhabitants of the city, she was sometimes not seen at public worship for months together. But we are left to infer that all the while she attended certain nightly conventicles which awakened much suspicion. Her movements soon attracted the attention of her neighbour the Bishop of Ossory; he charged her with witchcraft; and, as in the Decretals of Pope John XXII., sorcery had recently been denounced as a form of heresy, he determined to institute a prosecution. In the first instance the lady deemed it prudent to compound for her alleged offences by the payment of a fine; but, when a second suit was commenced, and when an application was made to the Irish chancellor to have Alice, and certain others described as her accomplices, thrown into prison, that functionary endeavoured to persuade Ledred to desist from his proceedings. Le Poer, the Seneschal of Kilkenny, gave the same advice; but the bishop was inexorable. The lady was now cited into

1 It is a curious fact that in the seventeenth century there was a house in Kilkenny known as "Kettler's Inne." "The name, corrupted into *Kelter*, is still to be found amongst the humbler classes in the locality."—*Journal of the Kilkenny and S.E. of Ireland Archæological Society*, vol. iv., p. 155. New series.

the Bishop's court; and, as she did not appear, she was excommunicated. Her son, William Outlaw, was likewise required to present himself for judgment before the same tribunal; but Le Poer, the seneschal, interfered, arrested the Bishop himself, and put him into confinement. For this act he was excommunicated, and the whole Diocese of Ossory placed under an interdict. Ledred was now released from imprisonment; but he had no sooner obtained his liberty than he again cited the mother and son into his court. At this crisis the Irish chancellor interposed, and the Bishop was served with a royal writ requiring him, under penalty of one thousand pounds, to appear in person before the Viceroy, and account for his own conduct. At the same time he received a summons to attend the court of the Archbishop of Dublin, and answer the complaint of the Seneschal of Kilkenny. When the parties met in the Irish metropolis, an apparent reconciliation was effected between Le Poer and the Bishop; but notwithstanding all the influence of Dame Alice and her son, the suit against them was continued. In the end the lady was pronounced a sorceress and relapsed heretic, her goods were confiscated, and she and her confederates were handed over to the secular authorities for punishment. A public bonfire was made in Kilkenny of her chattels, including certain powders, ointments, philters, a host—said to be inscribed with the devil's name—and other supposed necromantic articles found in her house; a female, named Petronilla, convicted as one of her confederates, was burnt; and, according to some,[1] Alice herself shared the same fate. William Outlaw, with difficulty, obtained a pardon, after having solemnly promised to accompany the first pilgrimage to the Holy Land; to provide a priest to celebrate mass every day in the chapel of St. Mary at Kilkenny; to visit, as soon as possible, the shrine of St. Thomas à Becket at Canterbury; to abstain from meat every Wednesday till he had completed his pilgrimage; to hear three masses every day; to feed a certain number of the poor; and to cover with lead, at his own

[1] According to Clyn, who lived at the time, and who was a friar connected with the place, Dame Alice was put to death, and was the first who thus suffered for heresy in Ireland. His testimony seems conclusive.

expense, the chancel and all the rest of the cathedral of St. Canice, Kilkenny, from the belfry eastward.[1] The Bishop did not stop even here in the prosecution. Some of the inhabitants of the city, charged with sorcery and heresy, suffered at the stake. Others, when forced to abjure their imputed crimes, were publicly branded on the front and back of their upper garments with the sign of the cross. Others, who could neither hide themselves nor escape, were beaten with cudgels through the town, or, as excommunicated persons, expelled from the diocese.[2]

These trials for heresy created a wonderful sensation, and were deemed of such consequence that they are recorded among the most notable transactions of the age by the Irish annalists of the fourteenth century.[3] We have no version of the proceedings furnished, either by Dame Alice herself, or any of her party; and the accounts given by the monkish writers are evidently one-sided. The lady was unquestionably no ordinary character: she did not much respect the clergy; she certainly did not hold the doctrines commonly reputed orthodox; and she, in all likelihood, possessed a knowledge of the properties of natural agents which amazed and perplexed her superstitious neighbours. The evidence on which

[1] This transaction is described in Clyn's *Annals* and in Grace's *Annals*. See also Gilbert's *Viceroys*, pp. 161-2; and a contemporary narrative, edited for the Camden Society by Wright. 1843. About the year 1324 Roger Outlaw, prior of the hospital of Kilmainham and chancellor of Ireland, made over for ten years the fruits of certain churches to the Dean and Chapter of the Kilkenny Cathedral, as security that William Outlaw would cover the chancel &c. with lead, according to his engagement. See *Narrative of Proceedings against Dame Alice Kyteler*, pp. 28, 36, 37. Printed for the Camden Society.

[2] Gilbert's *Viceroys of Ireland*, p, 162. About the same time another Irishman, named Adam Duff, was burnt for heresy. See Grace's *Annals*, at A.D. 327. Nearly at the same time one of the O'Tooles was burned outside the city of Dublin "on a charge of entertaining heretical opinions and *impugning the Holy See.*"—Gilbert's *Viceroys*, p. 165. According to some, this O'Toole was no other than Duff.

[3] It is not to the credit of the Four Masters, who wrote in the seventeenth century, that they pass them over without any notice. The reputed errorists were not confined to the diocese of Ossory. In 1353 the Bishop of Waterford caused two Irishmen of the clan of the MacNamaras to be burnt for heresy. *Journal of the Kilkenny and S.E. of Ireland Archæological Society*, vol. vi. New series. 1867. p. 88, *note*.

she was convicted was delivered in her absence, and illustrates rather the credulity and ignorance of the witnesses than the guilt of the accused. Some rays of the light which, at a more advanced period of the century, dawned on Wycliffe and the Lollards may already have reached Kilkenny; for, though a number of the charges preferred against those now treated with such cruelty may be imputed to bigotry, stupidity, or prejudice, there are others which cannot be thus explained. The sufferers are said to have affirmed that the "sacrament of the body of Christ is by no means to be worshipped," and that "they were not bound to believe or obey the decrees, decretals, and apostolical mandates," that is, the ordinances of the Bishop of Rome.[1] As we read the extant narratives of this prosecution, we cannot well avoid the inference that the Bishop of Ossory was prompted, throughout the whole affair, quite as much by avarice and offended pride, as by a zeal for the suppression of heresy. Dame Alice escaped, in the first instance, by the payment of a fine; and had she subsequently used her wealth a little more freely, she might possibly have found her assailants more propitious. Ledred obviously enjoyed but little of the sympathy of Bicknor, Archbishop of Dublin, who, on one occasion, stopped him in his career; and the Irish chancellor was still more opposed to his proceedings. The penance imposed on William Outlaw was obviously dictated by a desire to enrich the Church at the expense of the wealthy merchant; and Ledred certainly hit on an original method of rectifying an errorist, when he condemned him to cover the cathedral with lead from the belfry eastward.[2]

[1] See a letter from the Pope to Edward III., dated November 6th, 1335, in Theiner's *Vet. Monumenta*, p. 269. It would appear from this that the reputed heretics maintained their existence in the diocese of Ossory long after the condemnation of Dame Alice and Petronilla. According to the Pope, they held a variety of sentiments—some of them asserting that Jesus Christ was a sinful man. But they were doubtless much belied. The Pope complains in his communication that neither in Ireland nor England "had inquisitors of heresy been appointed;" and that "heretical pravity was not wont to be detected and punished *by the regular officers of an inquisition.*" See Brenan, p. 333.

[2] In the *Seventh Letter of Columbanus ad Hibernos*, pp. 93-100, Dr. O'Conor exposes with deserved severity the tyranny of Ledred.

Ledred, as we have seen, was indebted for his promotion, as Bishop of Ossory, to the See of Rome; he was a keen advocate of papal claims; and his confidence in the support of his Italian patron often emboldened him to act with great insolence. He was one of those men who contrive to make themselves disagreeable to all around them; and who care not to embroil both Church and State, if they can but gratify their own ambition or selfishness. When he was determined to carry a favourite project, he did not hesitate either to traffic on the superstitions of the multitude, or to prostitute the most sacred ordinances of the Church. It was not strange that he was desirous to be freed from ecclesiastical control. The Archbishops of Dublin, who frequently acted as Viceroys of Ireland,[1] and who were too much immersed in politics to attend properly to their spiritual duties, had for forty years neglected the visitation of the diocese of Ossory.[2] In A.D. 1335, when Primate Bicknor appeared there, Ledred was exceedingly dissatisfied; he asserted a prescriptive privilege of exemption from metropolitical supervision; and, when he appealed to the Pope, his indulgent patron conceded the claim.[3] In A.D. 1329 the English government complained to John XXII. that he had fomented feuds and dissensions among the nobles of Ireland; and that, when summoned to appear before the King and Council, he had stolen away to Avignon—where the Pontiff then resided—to screen himself by false representations. Ten years afterwards, this persecutor of Dame Alice was himself arraigned for heresy: his accuser was no less a personage than Bicknor, Archbishop of Dublin: but, instead of meeting the charge before his metropolitan, Ledred again sheltered himself under an appeal to

---

[1] Alexander de Bicknor, who was Archbishop of Dublin from A.D. 1317 to A.D. 1349, entered on the office of Lord Justice as soon as he arrived in Ireland. He subsequently fell into disgrace, and was "obliged to throw himself on the clemency of Edward II., and to acknowledge that he had falsified his accounts by the introduction of counterfeit writs and acquittances." Gilbert's *Viceroys*, p. 120.

[2] *Fratris Johannis Clyn Annales Hiberniae*, ad an. 1335. *Irish Arch. Society Publications.*

[3] Harris's *Ware*, i. 331. Ledred pleaded that Bicknor, the Archbishop, was personally hostile to him. The right of the metropolitan was eventually recognised.

the papal tribunal.[1] At a later period he was accused of the vulgar crime of acting as an accomplice to an incendiary, a robber, and a murderer.[2] He did not venture to plead his innocence, but produced the king's pardon; and though it appeared that the document had been obtained surreptitiously, he eventually managed to escape the danger in which he was involved by the transaction. This very unamiable churchman occupied the See of Ossory for upwards of forty years.[3] His biographers tell us that he lived to a great age; that in his latter days, he betook himself to architecture; that he glazed his cathedral; and that he adorned its eastern window with stained glass of exquisite workmanship.[4]

At this period there were at least some clergymen in Ireland of a very different stamp from Bishop Richard Ledred of Ossory. Among these, Richard Fitzralph is worthy of particular notice. His relatives appear to have resided in England,[5] but he is said to have been born in Dundalk. He was educated at Oxford; he subsequently became Chancellor of that University, and Dean of Lichfield; and in 1347 he was advanced to the Primacy of Armagh. Fitzralph was an eloquent speaker and a celebrated preacher. The most intellectual audiences to be found in London, Lichfield, and Avignon, as well as in his own country, listened to his sermons with admiration. He is well known as an opponent of the mendicants. These begging friars, as has been already stated,

---

[1] Grace's *Annals*, p. 110, *note*. *Irish Arch. Soc. Publications.*

[2] Brenan, who gives a most partial account of Ledred and his proceedings, represents this charge as made against the bishop of Ossory at the time when he was contending with Le Poer and parties charged with heresy at Kilkenny. See his *Ecc. Hist.*, p. 332. A reference to the chronology is sufficient to prove that he is here quite mistaken. According to Clyn, who was a contemporary, and who had the best means of information, Dame Alice was prosecuted in A.D. 1324; whereas the charge against Ledred of being an accomplice in robbing and burning the Castle of Moycobir, and of killing the owner, was not made until some time after the 20th of March, 1351. See Harris's *Ware*, i. 410.

[3] From A.D. 1318 to A.D. 1360.

[4] See Harris's *Ware*, i. 399, 410, 411. This famous window is said to have exceeded anything of the kind in Ireland at the time. It was destroyed during the commotions which disturbed Ireland about the middle of the seventeenth century. See Gilbert's *Viceroys*, p. 168.

[5] See Cotton's *Fasti*, iii. 15, *note*; King's *Primer*, p. 653. 1110.

made their appearance in Ireland in the early part of the thirteenth century, very soon after they obtained the papal sanction: their zeal was great; their preaching attracted much notice—for few of the parish ministers attempted to perform that duty; and their profession of poverty excited no little wonder at a time when clerical covetousness gave point to many bitter sarcasms. As they were empowered to dispense the various rites of the Church, they were no favourites with the secular clergy. The ordinary priests resented their appearance in their parishes, because they carried off no inconsiderable portion of the fees which would have otherwise fallen to them; whilst they lessened their influence, and not unfrequently assailed their reputation. These friars had now far degenerated from the strictness of their original institute; for though each brother might try to satisfy his conscience by saying that he had nothing, it often happened that the fraternity of which he was a member, possessed worldly goods in abundance.[1] But the importunity of the mendicants had not ceased with the growth of their property. "Scarce could any great or mean man of the clergy or laity eat his meat," said Fitzralph, "but such kind of beggars would be at his elbow—not like other poor folks humbly craving alms at the gate or door, but, without shame, intruding themselves into courts or houses, and lodging there—where, without inviting at all, they eat and drink what they can find among them; and, not content with that, they carry away with them either wheat, or meal, or bread, or flesh, or cheeses, although there were but two in a house, in a kind of extorting manner, there being none that can deny them, unless he would cast away

[1] Thus, the Dominican Convent of St. Saviour, Dublin, had in addition to "divers property in the city of Dublin," possessions in Meath, consisting of 120 acres of land with six messuages.—Brenan, 305. The Dominican Convent of St. Mary in Cork had ten messuages and eighty acres of land. 307. Even the Franciscans, who insisted so much on poverty, did not live up to their principles. The Franciscan Convent of Multifernan in Westmeath had among its appurtenances "a water mill and thirty acres of arable land," p. 310. These acres were very much larger than our present statute acres. The Carmelite Convent at Dublin had, with eleven acres of land, nine houses with gardens and orchards and an endowment of £5 annually—equal to £100 a year of our present currency. Brenan, p. 316.

natural shame."[1] These begging friars perambulated the country; preached and received confessions wherever they obtained encouragement; and relaxed the discipline of the Church by granting absolution to the most infamous characters. Fitzralph, in one of his works, mentions a fact which illustrates the state of society in Ireland at this period, as well as the way in which the mendicants contributed to corrupt the population. "I have," says he, "as I reckon, in my diocese of Armagh two thousand subjects, who by reason of the sentences of excommunication annually enacted against wilful homicides, public robbers, incendiaries, and other such characters, have become involved in sentences of excommunication; out of whom there scarcely come fourteen in the year to me or my penitentiaries; and all such persons receive the sacraments like other people, and are spoken of as absolved; and this by none other but the friars."[2]

Though Fitzralph was not at all aware of the extent to which the Church had deviated from the faith of primitive times, he possessed somewhat of the spirit of a reformer: we find him thankfully declaring how "the Lord had taught him, and brought him out of the profound vanities of Aristotle's philosophy to the study of the Scriptures:"[3] and, convinced that the mendicant system was thoroughly indefensible, he assailed it with boldness and severity. He maintained that, though the Saviour, for our sakes, became poor, He did not prefer poverty for its own sake; that He never voluntarily begged; that He never taught His followers to go about as mendicants; and that no one can, with prudence and piety, take an obligation to devote himself to a life of perpetual begging. He insisted, further, that all who confessed to the mendicants—even though these friars had authority from the Pope—were bound, according to the canons, to confess the

---

[1] See King's *Primer*, ii. 589.

[2] *Defensorium Curatorum*, p. 11. ed 1633. See King's *Primer*, 1110.

[3] See Anderson's *Historical Sketches of the Native Irish*, p. 17. Edinburgh, 1828. Fitzralph maintained that presbyters, in cases of necessity, could ordain bishops. "Si omnes episcopi simul essent defuncti, sacerdotes minores possent episcopos ordinare et etiam consecrare." See O'Conor's *Columbanus ad Hibernos*. No. vii. Introd. Letter, xxvi., *note*.

same sins once a year to their parish priests. These propositions gave deadly offence to all orders of the mendicants; Fitzralph was denounced as heterodox; and cited before the tribunal of the Pope at Avignon. The trial lasted for three years; and the Archbishop meanwhile continued to defend himself with indomitable resolution. But the influence of the Dominicans and Franciscans was immense; and the Pope could not afford to quarrel with them. Fitzralph's opinions were condemned; and he was admonished to beware of advancing anything in future, either in his writings or discourses, which might be construed into an attack on the mendicants. The Primate did not long survive this decision. He died in 1360—not without suspicion of having been poisoned by the enraged monks.[1] During the progress of this controversy he enunciated principles which, if carried out to their legitimate conclusions, would have shaken the Papacy to its foundations.[2] So great was his reputation for sanctity, that a few were disposed to give him credit as a worker of miracles. Some time after his death his body was brought home to Ireland, and buried at his native town of Dundalk.

At this period the power of the crown was declining rapidly in Ireland. Though the invasion of Bruce was unsuccessful, it contributed greatly to weaken the English interest. Many of the colonists were meanwhile driven out of Ulster; the native chiefs were emboldened; and the boundaries of the English settlements almost everywhere circumscribed.[3] Bruce

[1] Harris's *Ware*, i. 83.

[2] It is reported that, in 1530, an Irish translation of the *New Testament*, supposed to be his production, was found concealed in the wall of his church at Armagh, when the building was undergoing repair. *Balæus Script. Brit.* cent. xiv., p. 246. Anderson's *Hist. Sketches*, p. 18. Foxe, in his *Acts and Monuments*, says :—"I credibly hear of certain old Irish *Bibles*, translated long since into the Irish tongue, which, if it be true, it is not other like but to be the doing of this Armachanus." Vol. i., p. 579. London, 1844. The copy of the Irish *Testament*, said to have been found in the wall of the church of Armagh, is not now forthcoming.

[3] Shortly after Bruce's invasion, a sept of the O'Neills, known as *Clan Aeilka Buidhe*, or the tribe of *Yellow Hugh*, crossed the Bann, expelled most of the settlers from a portion of Eastern Ulster, and established in this district a principality which acquired the name of *Clannaboy*, or Clandeboye.—Gilbert's *Viceroys*, p. 185. As already stated, twelve counties are said to have been formed in Ireland

is said to have triumphed over his antagonists in eighteen successive battles; and, though at length overpowered—when his troops were weakened by pestilence and famine—he had clearly shown the Irish the way to victory. Some of the descendants of the original adventurers, in the hope of living more comfortably in the country, had already commenced to disguise themselves by adopting Irish customs, and by assuming the Irish dress; but persons of this class—known as *the degenerate English*—now rapidly multiplied. In various districts the military force at the disposal of government was quite insufficient to protect them; the wilder spirits among them sometimes found it convenient to pass themselves off as mere Irishmen—for, under the Brehon law, they could satisfy the judge with a fine if they committed homicide or murder; they felt that if they remained among the natives, and yet attempted to maintain their position as a privileged class, they were doomed to gradual extirpation: and they therefore deemed it safer to accommodate themselves to circumstances, and to amalgamate with the aboriginal population. The natives were firmly bound together by the ties of *gossipred*, or sponsorship, and *fosterage*. Among them sponsorship was not a merely complimentary relation; it implied a substantial guardianship. The gossip, or sponsor, actually reared the infant; and thus, for ever afterwards, the parties cherished towards each other the feelings of parents and children. One Irish chief brought up the offspring of another; so that their families were often knit together in indissoluble friendship. The degenerate English used the Irish language, as well as the Irish garb; conformed to Irish habits; intermarried with the natives; and sought still farther to strengthen their alliance with them by gossipred and fosterage.[1] In many cases they laid aside their English names,

---

in the reign of King John. See before, p. 229, *note* (2). "In the reign of Edward I. we find sheriffs also of Connaught and Roscommon. Thus, except the northern province and some of the central districts, all Ireland was shire-ground, and subject to the crown in the thirteenth century."—HALLAM'S *Constitutional History of England*, p. 836, *note*, ed. London, 1870.

The Brehon law regulated all matters relating to fosterage. Stirabout was to given to all the children; but the flavouring was to be different. Salt butter

and adopted Irish designations. The De Burgos, or Burkes, called themselves Mac Williams; the Berminghams, Mac Yoris; whilst some of the Fitzgeralds in Munster took the name of Mac Maurice, and others that of Mac Gibbon.[1] The attachment of the colonists to the British crown was greatly weakened by the ill-advised proceedings of the sovereign. In A.D. 1341 Edward III. gave instructions to his Viceroy to remove all officers of whatever rank "married and estated in Ireland, but without possessions in England;" and to substitute "competent Englishmen, having lands, tenements, and benefices in England."[2] He hoped by this arrangement to secure complete control over public functionaries; but he only added to the embarrassment of his government by alienating many of its most powerful and trustworthy supporters. The descendants of the original colonists, who had no property in Great Britain, felt insulted and aggrieved; combined in self-defence; and cultivated a closer connection with the native kings and chieftains.

Instead of retracing its steps, and endeavouring to conciliate a discontented population, the English government adhered to its misguided policy; and contrived to aggravate the mischief by drawing harder lines of distinction between the various classes of Irish society. In 1367 its folly culminated in a Parliament[3] assembled at Kilkenny, where a penal code, embodying many regulations of revolting severity, was pro-

---

was to be put into it for the sons of the inferior grades; fresh butter for the sons of chieftains; and honey for the sons of kings.—*Senchus Mor*, vol. ii., p. 149.

[1] Sir John Davys's *Historical Relations*, p. 40. Dublin, 1704.

[2] Gilbert's *Viceroys*, p. 191; Leland, i. 299.

[3] The origin of Parliaments in Ireland has been the subject of much discussion. Some trace them up to 1172, or the commencement of the government of Henry II. n Ireland. In the Magna Charta of Henry III., among the rights confirmed to the English settlement in Ireland, was that of "being governed by their own laws, made by their own consent, in their own Parliament."—Campbell's *Strictures*, p. 341. But the first Parliament deserving the name was held by Sir John Wogan, Lord Justice, in 1295. Sir John Davys, in his celebrated speech before the Lord Deputy in 1613, states that the Parliament convened at Kilkenny in 1367 was the most famous which had then been held, and that the Parliament of 1613 was the first representation of the people. Thirteen Cistercian abbots were lords of Parliament; and the abbot of Mellifont, a Cistercian, had precedence of all other abbots. Grace's *Annals*, p. 12, *note*. *Irish Arch. Soc. Publications.*

posed and adopted. This code—known as the *Statute of Kilkenny*—holds a bad pre-eminence among the worst specimens of Irish legislation.[1] It provided that marriage, nurture of infants, and gossipred with the Irish, should be considered and punished as HIGH TREASON; and that, if any man of English race should use an Irish name, the Irish language, the Irish apparel, or any mode or custom of the Irish, he should forfeit his lands and tenements. It declared that no Irishman should be admitted into any cathedral or collegiate church by provision, collation, or presentation, nor to any benefice among the English; that any such presentation should be held void; and that the right of presentation, for that avoidance, should belong, not to the patron, but to the King. It further provided that no monastery or religious house, situate among the English, should henceforth receive any Irishman; and that, should it do so, its temporalities should be forfeited to the crown. These odious laws were promulgated with great solemnity, and the Church basely lent its sanction to them; for the eight prelates who sat in this Parliament threatened all who dared to violate them with excommunication.[2]

Whilst these Bishops were thus labouring to perpetuate distinctions which they should have been anxious to obliterate, they were otherwise exhibiting a most unworthy example to the Irish people. The Metropolitans of Armagh and Dublin, with unabated virulence, kept up a struggle for

---

[1] This statute, edited by Mr. Hardiman, may be found among the publications of the Irish Archæological Society. Dublin, 1843. *Tracts Relating to Ireland*, vol. ii. It is rather a series of statutes, than a statute, as it consists of thirty-four distinct acts, besides the conclusion.

[2] The *prelates* whose names are embodied in the statute, and who "at the request" of the Duke of Clarence, the viceroy, "fulminate sentence of excommunication," are the Archbishops of Dublin, Cashel, and Tuam, and the Bishops of Lismore and Waterford, Killaloe, Ossory, Leighlin, and Cloyne. It has been remarked that of these eight prelates "three were Irishmen and seven were indebted for their promotion to the papal appointment."—KING'S *Primer*, p. 661. See also Phelan's *Remains*, ii. 114. At this time, according to Sir John Davys, such of the Bishops and Archbishops "as were resident in the mere Irish counties, and did not acknowledge the King to be their patron, *were never summoned to any Parliament.*" See his speech in Leland, ii. 496, app.

precedence.[1] As the Archbishop of Dublin was more closely connected with the seat of government than his rival, he had often greater political influence;[2] but the Archbishop of Armagh could claim for his See a higher antiquity, as it could not be denied that his primacy existed before Dublin had attained the Archiepiscopal dignity. The northern Archbishop insisted on having his cross carried before him when in Dublin; and as attempts to assert this privilege were opposed by force, collisions occurred which led to battery and bloodshed. This ridiculous controversy was kept up for centuries. In A.D. 1353 the question was submitted to Pope Innocent VI., who, acting under the advice of the College of Cardinals, decided that "each of these prelates should be Primate; while, for distinction of style, the Primate of Armagh should entitle himself *Primate of all Ireland*, but the Metropolitan of Dublin should subscribe himself *Primate of Ireland*."[3] This sage award did not put an end to the dispute. The ecclesiastical belligerents managed, on various grounds, to keep alive the contention; and, even when the great Reformation had illustrated the absurdity of the whole discussion, official pride would not permit it to disappear for another century.[4]

A dispute of a very different nature, in which several Bishops signalized themselves, illustrates the spirit which distinguished not a few Irish churchmen in the fourteenth century. A tax known as *Coyne and Livery*[5]—exacted from

---

[1] See before Book II., Chap. II. p. 235.

[2] It has been remarked that "in the reign of Edward III. the estates of the Archbishop of Dublin were such that he was *probably the richest prelate in the British Isles*."—*Calendar of Patent and Close Rolls of Chancery in Ireland*, by Morrin, vol. ii., preface p. xx. Dublin, 1862.

[3] Brenan, p. 324. The supporters of Armagh denied the authority of this decision. See *Jus Primatiale Armacanum*, p. 52. In 1365 the suit was again renewed. See Malone, p. 227.

[4] In 1634, the Lord Deputy Wentworth decided the dispute in favour of Ussher, who was then Archbishop of Armagh. See Harris's *Ware*, i. 76-80; Elrington's *Life of Ussher*, p. 160, and appendix vi. p. cxxix. The dispute was kept up afterwards in the Romish Church. In 1728 Hugh MacMahon, R.C., Archbishop of Armagh, published his famous work on the subject entitled *Jus Primatiale Armacanum*.

[5] Implying the expense connected with the maintenance of men and horses. See Hallam's *Const. Hist.*, chap. xviii., vol. iii. p. 348. London, 1855. "Under the

their tenants by the great Anglo-Irish landowners, professedly for the purpose of enabling them to meet their military expenditure when defending the English settlements—had long been the subject of much complaint. To put an end to the necessity for this levy, and at the same time to make provision for the protection of the colonists, the Irish Parliament, in 1346, had authorised government to collect an assessment from all persons who had a certain amount of property. Ralph Kelly, an Irishman just promoted to the Archbishopric of Cashel[1]—though he had sworn allegiance, and had received his temporalities from the King—proclaimed his determination to resist this demand. He maintained that *the Church was free*—a statement which meant, according to his interpretation, that it was not liable to taxation. With the concurrence of his suffragans—the Bishops of Emly, Limerick,[2] and Lismore—he issued an ordinance, announcing that all clergymen, presuming to pay their allotted portions of the subsidy, were immediately to be deprived of their livings, and rendered incapable of holding any ecclesiastical preferment within the province. This manifesto further declared that all lay tenants complying with the requisition were to be excommunicated; and that their children were to be disqualified from holding any benefice even to the third generation. To impart greater emphasis to their proceedings, the four prelates proceeded to the town of Clonmel; and presented themselves before the inhabitants in the principal street, arrayed in their pontifical vestments. The Archbishop there publicly excommunicated all who had "paid, imposed, procured, or in any way contributed to the exacting of this subsidy from any of the persons or lands belonging to his Church;" and denounced, by name, William Epworth, the King's Commissioner in the county of Tipperary, "for

name of livery, the soldiers took, without payment, victuals for themselves and provender for their horses; and exacted weekly money payments, designated 'coygnes.'"—RICHEY'S *Lectures on the History of Ireland*, p. 207. Dublin, 1869.

[1] He was a native of Drogheda, and a Carmelite monk. He died in 1361.

[2] Another Bishop of Limerick in this century signalized himself by the intemperance of his conduct. He came into collision with the Archbishop of Cashel, treated him with personal violence, and compelled him to make his escape from Limerick. See Mant, i. 21, and Ware.

receiving it from the several collectors."[1] Kelly and his suffragans were prosecuted for this defiance of the law; but, when found guilty, government seemed afraid to punish; and in the end the mitred rebels escaped unscathed. Shortly afterwards, Richard Ledred, Bishop of Ossory, so famous for his prosecution of Dame Alice, excommunicated the King's Treasurer because he sought to collect another subsidy from the tenants of his See. Ledred was permitted, with equal impunity, to resist the civil power.[2]

When Christianity is rightly understood and practised, it is better fitted than any other system to promote the reign of peace and love; but when those who undertake to teach it are themselves ignorant of its spirit, very little of its real character can be seen. In the fourteenth century well-meaning Irishmen must have found it difficult to ascertain its genuine features. The Bishops were literally "lords over God's heritage:" they intruded into the province of the civil magistrate: and they were empowered to scourge, fine, and imprison. The inferior clergy often acted the part of spiritual despots; they whipped the people as so many beasts of burden; they claimed immunities to which they had no proper title; and they expressed their resentment in no measured terms when their proceedings were challenged, or when they were not permitted to carry out their usurpations. But whilst the Church was sinking deeper and deeper into moral degradation, its wealth was rapidly accumulating. Never were tithes exacted more rapaciously. In a series of constitutions drawn up in 1378 for the use of the diocese of Armagh,[3] we have a minute and elaborate enumeration of the

[1] Leland, i. 311.

[2] See Gilbert's *Viceroys*, p. 204; and Harris's *Ware*, i. 410. Archbishop Kelly, a few years afterwards, signalized himself by another very outrageous proceeding. Two Irishmen had, it appears, been burned by the Bishop of Waterford for heresy—by which was meant "some contumely offered to the Virgin Mary." See p. 284. *note* (3). The Archbishop was indignant because the act was done without his license; and, guarded by a numerous troop of armed men, he made an assault, about midnight, on the Bishop of Waterford in his lodgings, "grievously wounded him, and many others who were in his company, and robbed him of his goods."—Harris's *Ware*, i. 533.

[3] These constitutions may be found in Renehan's *Collections on Irish Church*

dues to be paid to the rector of each parish. Almost every possible source of emolument is included in these regulations. Tithe must be paid for milk throughout the year; for meadows, pasture-lands, fisheries, and turbaries; for bees, game, geese, ducks, and chickens; for pigeons and peacocks; for fruit-trees, grain, and vegetables; for sheep and swine; and for profits arising from all kinds of labour, handicraft, and merchandize. Any one resisting these assessments is forbidden to enter the Church; and, should he afterwards submit, he must be sent for absolution to the Bishop. The rector was also entitled to receive what were called "lesser tithes," consisting of oblations made at the chief festivals, as well as offerings at baptisms, churchings, marriages, and confirmations. He claimed a gallon of drink from every brewing,[1] and a tenth of the goods of all deceased persons when their debts were paid, besides sundry other perquisites. But the parish priests were not always permitted to appropriate the whole of these revenues. In certain cases the Bishops had a fourth of the tithes,[2] in addition to the income derived from their landed possessions. The rectors could well afford such a deduction; and in these days the clergy, of whatever grade, had very little reason to complain of an insufficient maintenance.

The doctrine of Purgatory—of which we hear nothing in the early days of the Irish Church[3]—was at this time gene-

---

History, pp. 135-8. Dublin, 1861. In the matter of first fruits the Irish Church put forth a claim not made elsewhere. "What are the lawful firstlings?" says the *Senchus Mor*. "Every first-born, *i.e.*, every first-birth of every human couple." —*Senchus Mor.*, iii. 39. If the first-born were a daughter, there was a difficulty; but the first son born took her place. This son either became a clergyman, or was to assist in cultivating the church lands.

[1] See Malone's *Church History of Ireland*, p. 190. We are to remember that private families now brewed their own ale. In 1524 there was a dispute between the monks of St. Thomas, Dublin, and some of the justices on this subject. It was decided that, when there was a brewing of sixteen bushels, a tribute of a gallon and a half should be paid to the monks. Malone, p. 403.

[2] See a letter from Pope Alexander IV. on this subject in *Theiner*, p. 75.

[3] Even in the ninth century it is ignored by Sedulius. He speaks of the end o this life as that "to which either death or life succeeds;" and he calls death "the gate through which we enter into our kingdom."—*Comment.* on Rom. vii. and 1. Cor. iii. See also *Ware's Works*, by Harris, i. 25.

rally accepted. Strange tales were told of what happened in the middle state; and the parish priests and friars received no inconsiderable revenue for their services in delivering souls from its mysterious inflictions. There was a place in the county of Donegal where, according to the current superstition, it was possible to anticipate and abridge the pains of future suffering; and where not a few spent twelve or twenty-four hours in a gloomy and disgusting cavern, hoping thus to escape more terrible penalties after death. To this spot—known as St. Patrick's Purgatory in Lough Dearg [1]—pilgrims travelled from distant lands. It came first into notice in the twelfth century—an age of increasing ignorance: it was soon found, by the priests of the priory connected with it, to yield large profits; its fame increased; and, at the period before us, persons of high rank were not ashamed to repair to it that they might find relief from the terrors of a guilty conscience. The penitents sometimes spent fifteen days in preparatory fasting and devotion before entering the vault, and as many more in similar exercises when they had completed their hours of confinement in its dark and loathsome chambers. But all the pilgrims were not equally gratified by their visit to St. Patrick's Purgatory. Some of them had so much common sense remaining as to see that the whole affair was a delusion. Froissart has preserved the evidence of Sir William de Lisle, who entered the place along with another knight in 1399, and who states that they were both overpowered by sleep while descending the steps into the cellar; that, in their sleep, "they fell into strange imaginations and marvellous dreams," no doubt suggested by their most uncomfortable lodgings; that in the morning, soon after they came forth, "they clean forgot" their visions; and that "they agreed in reckoning all that matter but a fantasy." [2] It was believed

[1] This high place of superstition has been illustrated by no inconsiderable amount of literature. See Lanigan, i. 368; *Giraldus Cambrensis*, edited by Kelly, i. 138-153; Gilbert's *Viceroys*, pp. 213, 275; and Moran's *Catholic Archbishops of Dublin*, i. 332-339. Moran states that, since the time of Benedict XIII, pilgrimages to the place have "been ever *cherished and encouraged* by the sovereign Pontiffs." p. 339.

[2] In A.D. 1497 the Purgatory was destroyed by order of the Pope, because

that at one time a subterraneous communication existed between the priory and the purgatory; and that, when the penitents were in the chamber of horrors, the crafty friars contrived in various ways to operate on their dupes.

In the fourteenth century Ireland was one of the most wretched countries in Europe. An appointment in this kingdom was deemed by many in the sister island equivalent to banishment; and on this ground it was maintained, in the British courts of law, that no one could be compelled to accept such preferment.[1] The English by birth and the English by blood regarded each other with much jealousy; their interests often came into collision; and their divisions contributed greatly to weaken the government. Some of the colonists left the country in disgust, and returned to South Britain; others entirely laid aside their national peculiarities; mingled with the aborigines; and became "more Irish than the Irish themselves." The natives were almost continually at war either with each other or with the colonists; government condescended to secure the support of some of the chieftains by the payment of subsidies; whilst many of them were treated as open enemies. The war of races extended to the monasteries. The monks who aspired to Church preferment sided with the English party; others cultivated more patriotic sentiments. "There was discord, as it were universally, amongst all the poor religious of Ireland," says a contemporary annalist, "some of them upholding, promoting, and cherishing the part of their own nation, and blood, and tongue; others of them canvassing for the offices of prelates

"it was the occasion of shameful avarice."—*Bollandists*, March 17th, p. 590. Its reputation subsequently revived; but early in the seventeenth century it was found to be such a moral nuisance that, in 1632, the Lords Justice again destroyed it and shut up the Priory. In the time of James II. it once more came into repute. Kelly writing shortly before the middle of the present century, describes it as visited annually by 10,000 pilgrims. *Camb. Evers.*, i. 146, *note*. "The season for pilgrimage now (1863) opens *by order of the bishop* on the 1st of June and closes on the 15th of August. . . . The boatman pays the landlord, as yearly rent, £200 or £300. The average number of pilgrims during the last month is estimated at about *one thousand daily*."—MALONE's *Church History of Ireland*, p. 393. Dublin, 1863.

[1] Leland, i. 325. See also Stuart's *Armagh*, p. 192.

and superiors."[1] The British monarch claimed the right of nominating to ecclesiastical dignities; but the confirmation of the Bishop of Rome was admitted to be necessary; and under various pretexts, the Pope contrived to engross most of the appointments. The clergy, as a body, were sadly in want of education; whilst the mass of the people presented a melancholy spectacle of ignorance, immorality, and barbarism.

In the beginning of the fourteenth century a feeble attempt was made to improve the means of public instruction. In 1310 John Lech, Archbishop of Dublin, obtained a Bull from the Pope for the establishment of a university in that city.[2] His death in 1313 interfered with the prosecution of the design. In 1320 the scheme revived under his successor, Alexander de Bicknor; and some steps were taken to carry it into execution. A divinity lecture was founded by Edward III.; but the seminary languished for want of support, and quickly sunk into a state of inefficiency. In 1365 the Irish Parliament proposed to erect a university at Drogheda. Dublin College seems to have already proved a failure, as the charter for the foundation of the new institute declared that "there is no university or general study in Ireland."[3] The University of Drogheda shared the fate of the University of Dublin.[4] About the close of the fourteenth century, the land which, seven hundred years before, had shed the light of its literature over the whole of the Western Church, had not a single seminary where a liberal education could be obtained.

---

[1] Clyn's *Annals*, ad. an. 1325, p. 17. *Irish Arch. Soc. publications.*

[2] Harris's *Ware*, i. 330.

[3] See Brenan, p. 325.

[4] In 1464, Thomas Fitzgerald, eighth Earl of Desmond, made an effort to promote education by endowing a collegiate church with a warden, eight fellows, and eight choristers, at Youghal; and an act was passed during his vice-royalty, authorising the establishment of a university at Drogheda; but these attempts to revive the interests of learning were eventually unsuccessful. In 1475 Sixtus IV., at the instance of the Dominicans and others, issued a Bull sanctioning the establishment of a university in Dublin; and in 1496 there seems to have been some kind of educational institute there; as in that year a provincial Synod voted an annual contribution for the support of lectures at St. Patrick's Cathedral, but all trace of this seminary soon disappears. See Richey's *Lectures*, second series, p. 72.

CHAPTER V.

FROM THE DEPOSITION OF RICHARD II. TO THE DEATH OF HENRY VII.[1] A.D. 1399 TO A.D. 1509.

WHEN we reach the fifteenth century we have arrived at one of the darkest and dreariest periods in the ecclesiastical history of Ireland. The English territory was now reduced to very narrow limits, for it was confined to the four counties of Dublin, Meath, Kildare, and Louth; and even these only partially acknowledged the jurisdiction of the British sovereign.[2] As the century advanced, his prospect of retaining possession of this district became more and more precarious. In the reign of Edward IV. the Archbishop of Dublin declared publicly that he was obliged to leave unvisited several churches of his diocese, because they were in districts where the supremacy of the crown of England was not recognized.[3] Had the native chiefs been united under one brave and skilful leader, they might easily have freed themselves from the last

---

[1] Henry IV., 1399-1413; Henry V., 1413-1422; Henry VI., 1422-1461; Edward IV., 1461-1483; Edward V., 1483-1483; Richard III., 1483-1485; Henry VII., 1485-1509.

[2] Gilbert's *Viceroys*, p. 288. The English settlements at one time extended from Wicklow to Dunluce. Louth was then "the heart of the Pale."—MOORE'S *Hist. of Ireland*, iii. 184, *note.* In the thirteenth century, "the bishoprics, even in Connaught and Munster, were not filled without the King's license: O'Conor and O'Neill paid their tribute of cows and marks, and obeyed the King's summons: and although frequently goaded into resistance by the oppressions of the earls of Ulster and the lords of Connaught, these Irish dynasts seem to have been willing to consider themselves as English lords and to have placed confidence in appeals to the justice of the English king."—Introd. to Clyn's *Annals*, p. xxi. *Irish Arch. Soc. publications.*

[3] Gilbert's *Viceroys*, p. 401.

remnants of British domination. Their divisions enabled the English to retain them in a kind of nominal vassalage.

The unsatisfactory state of the succession to the crown during the period before us, contributed not a little to weaken the British power in Ireland. The settled order of sovereignty had been disturbed by the deposition of Richard II. Two powerful families of royal lineage long struggled for the throne; and the noblest blood of England was shed during the wars of the Roses. When the White Rose of York was united to the Red Rose of Lancaster by the marriage of Henry VII., the controversy was virtually decided; and yet the spirit of faction did not permit the troubled waters immediately to rest. Two pretenders to the crown—Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck—were subsequently put forward; both appeared in Ireland; and each for a time acted his part with wonderful ability. The inglorious close of the career of Simnel—whose cheat was exposed, and who became a scullion in the royal kitchen—did not deter a number of the Irish churchmen from joining in a second rebellion under Warbeck. But the Pope adhered firmly to King Henry, and fulminated excommunication against all opposed to his authority.[1] The power of the Bishop of Rome was one of the strongest links by which Ireland was at this time bound to the British monarchy.

The English endeavoured to maintain their authority by resorting to expedients fitted to arrest all national progress, as well as to demoralize society. Aware that they would be quite powerless against a united people, they sought to sow dissensions among the natives; to revive old feuds; to array province against province, and chieftain against chieftain. Some of the petty potentates were permitted to exact "black rent"[2] from those who should have been protected by the government; whilst others were kept constantly in pay,[3] that

[1] A papal Bull relating to this subject, addressed to the Archbishops of Cashel and Tuam and the Bishops of Clogher and Ossory, may be found in Rymer's *Foedera*, tom. xii. ad. A.D. 1488. p. 332. London, 1727.

[2] As to this black rent see Leland, ii. 55; and Gilbert's *Viceroys*, pp. 315, 320, 322, 336-7.

[3] Leland, ii. 44. See also *Histor. Memoir of the O'Briens*, pp. 143, 162, and appendix A to that work.

they might be induced to live at peace with the colonists, and assist them in warring against their own countrymen. The Irish Parliament did not now command the respect it had enjoyed a century before; for the abridgment of the English settlements had narrowed the circle of its influence. Its members were paid for their attendance;[1] and yet a considerable number, on various grounds, sought to be excused for non-appearance.[2] Its proceedings were controlled by two great Anglo-Irish families—the Fitzgeralds and the Butlers[3]—each continually striving for ascendency; the public interest was often sacrificed to personal advantage or ambition; and resolutions were sometimes adopted which greatly embarrassed the British Government. The young impostor Simnel had been acknowledged in Ireland as rightful king by the highest officers of state; and had actually summoned a Parliament in which laws were framed and supplies voted.[4] Sir Edward Poynings, who was appointed Viceroy in 1494, obtained the sanction of the Irish legislature to a measure which prevented the recurrence of such proceedings. According to this act—known as Poynings' Act—a parliament could not thereafter be held in Ireland until the chief governor and his advisers had, in the first instance, certified to the King under their great seal, when it was to meet, as well as what bills were to be submitted to it for discussion; and until the English cabinet had signified its approval of these arrangements. This enactment virtually deprived the Irish legislature of its independence; but, had not some such regulation been adopted, the machinery of state could not have moved on without constant danger of collision.[5] Poynings' law exercised

[1] Gilbert's *Viceroys*, 384.

[2] In 1450 the bishops of Ossory, Leighlin, Down, and Limerick were fined for not attending Parliament that year. Harris's *Ware*, i. 414.

[3] The heads of these families were in the position of princes palatine, exercising the rights of sovereignty within their territories. "The three great lords of Kildare, Desmond, and Ormond, acted as independent princes, excluding the royal interference."—RICHEY'S *Lectures*, p. 206. First series.

[4] Leland, ii. 81.

[5] By a clause in this act (ch. 22) all English Statutes then existing were made of force in Ireland.

an important influence on the ecclesiastical, as well as on the civil history of the country in after ages.

The jealousies which had so long divided the Anglo-Irish and the native clergy, continued throughout the fifteenth century. It had, indeed, been found impracticable to enforce all the provisions of the Statute of Kilkenny; but the policy which dictated that penal code was still maintained;[1] and attempts were made from time to time to insist on the observance of some of its most odious arrangements. As many of the English by blood had married into native families of distinction, the Viceroys had been induced to grant licenses authorising the admission of "mere Irish clerics" to bishoprics, abbacies, and priories under the control of the government: and those who had been thus favoured, had bestowed the benefices in their gift on their own countrymen.[2] A statute, passed in 1416, prohibited the farther issue of these viceregal indulgences, and declared that bishops who collated Irishmen to livings, were to forfeit their temporalities.[3] In the Irish Parliament of 1421 a variety of charges were preferred against Richard O'Hedian, Archbishop of Cashel; and his partiality to the natives formed a prominent article in his indictment. His accuser stated that he was kind and humane to the Irish, and had no respect whatever for an Englishman; that he was never known to promote persons of that nation to any dignity in the Church, and that he allowed no bishop in his province to advance an Englishman to any benefice whatever.[4] O'Hedian contrived to escape the charge because it was urged that an archbishop should have been arraigned before an ecclesiastical tribunal, and because the accused prelate was popular and influential:[5] but the Church must have been in a miserable condition when any Irish metropolitan could be

---

[1] A Parliament, held at Trim in 1447, enacted that those who would be taken for Englishmen should shave the upper lip at least once a fortnight, and that those who neglected to do so should be treated as Irish enemies. Gilbert, p. 349. By a law passed in the tenth year of Henry VI., it was made felony for any subject of the King to sell merchandise in a fair or market among "the Irish enemies" in time of either peace or war.—*Haverty*, p. 331.

[2] Gilbert, p. 309. [3] *Ibid.* [4] Brenan, p. 363.

[5] O'Hedian was Archbishop of Cashel from A.D. 1406 to A.D. 1440. He had a great taste for architecture.

arraigned as an offender for acting in a kindly spirit to ecclesiastics of his own nation. Towards the close of the fifteenth century the Irish administration felt it necessary formally to relax the stringency of the penal laws. We are told, for example, that the English Archbishop of Dublin obtained parliamentary permission—in cases where the parties took the English oath of allegiance—to promote Irish clerics to benefices of his diocese, "situated among the Irish enemies, where no English could, or dared, inhabit."[1]

If we judge of the Irish literati of the fifteenth century from the memorials they have left behind them, we must form a very humble estimate of their acquirements and intelligence. The writers are few, and their productions of little value. The author best known to after ages is Charles Maguire, who, in the *Annals of Ulster*, has given us an abstract of Irish history, terminating with his death in 1495.[2] This work is compiled almost entirely from preceding chronicles, and is unattractive as a literary composition. It is a bald catalogue of events arranged in the form of an annual register: some of its statements rest on very doubtful evidence: and it displays much credulity as well as very limited information. But, in the absence of other documents now lost, it throws light on various transactions of importance. At this period, the mass of the people were sunk in ignorance; few could read; writing materials were scarce and expensive;[3] and proficiency in penmanship was a rare accomplishment. During this century the art of printing was discovered in Germany; but generations passed away before the compositor and his types found their way into Ireland.[4]

---

[1] Gilbert, p. 420.

[2] Maguire is said to have been a native of County Fermanagh and Dean of Clogher. His *Annals* were revised by Roderick Cassidy, and continued to 1541. See O'Conor, *Rerum Hib. Script. Veteres.*, tom. i., Prolog. clxviii-clxx.; Brenan, p. 386.

[3] Clyn, in 1349, mentions that he had left parchment for the continuation of his *Annals*—evidently implying that the want of writing materials was then much felt.

[4] Another novelty of a very different description was introduced into Ireland in the fifteenth century, viz., the use of fire-arms. They are first mentioned in the *Irish Annals*, in 1487. In the following year cannon made their appearance in the country. *Haverty*, p. 335.

The knowledge of Scripture, for which the Irish were famous seven or eight hundred years before, had now disappeared. In all the records of these times there is no recognition of their intimacy with "the prophetical, evangelical, and apostolical writings;"[1] and at this period very few complete copies of the Bible could have been found in the whole island.[2] When the light of the Word of God was removed, anile superstitions multiplied. The jubilee of the fiftieth year had in the century preceding been instituted at Rome;[3] in 1451 multitudes flocked there to the celebration; and seven Irishmen were among the pilgrims crushed to death in a crowd assembled on the occasion in the pontifical city.[4] Pilgrimages to Compostella were also popular: and we read how the chieftain, Calvagh O'Conor, "went to the city of St. James's in Spain, and returned in health, after receiving indulgences in his sins."[5] In these days of darkness the Church profited richly by the death of every person of distinction. Thady O'Conor, known as "half king of Connaught,"[6] is said to have had a magnificent funeral; and the annalist adds that "it was difficult to account how many offerings—both cows, horses, and moneys—were bestowed to God's honour for his soul."[7] The spiritual light was very dim, but there was no lack of artificial illumination. Wax candles were in great request. Acts of the reign of Edward IV. secured grants to the abbot and convent of Trim for "the ordering, establishing, repairing, and con-

[1] See before, Book i., pp. 48, 49, 60.

[2] In the *Proceedings of the Kilkenny and S.E. of Ireland Archæological Society* (vol. v., Part i. New series. 1864. pp. 8-12) there is an account of a MS. copy of the Latin Bible, written about A.D. 1350 in France, but long preserved in Ireland. The book seems to have been in this country since A.D. 1400.

[3] The Jubilee was originally instituted by Boniface VIII. in A.D. 1300. It was ordained in A.D. 1350 that it should be observed every fiftieth year. See Murdock's *Mosheim*, by Soames, ii. 608.

[4] Harris's *Ware*, i. 341.

[5] These are exactly the words of the record. See the *Annals of Ireland*, from 1443 to 1468, p. 230. *Irish Archæol. Miscellany*, vol. i. Dublin, 1846. Margaret, wife of Calvagh O'Conor, is famous in Irish history for her magnanimity and personal accomplishments. See *Haverty*, p. 327, *note*.

[6] *i.e.* King *with opposition*, or with a disputed title, or with another claimant. See *Senchus Mor.*, vol. ii., p. 225.

[7] *Annals of Ireland*, from 1443 to 1468, p. 225.

tinuance" of a perpetual wax light burning before an image of Mary, and for the support of four other wax tapers to grace special celebrations.[1] Prayers for the dead seem to have been quite as much appreciated as prayers for the living; and the highest dignitaries of the Church were not ashamed to avow, before they left the world, that they did not regard their own salvation as secure. John Mey, who was Archbishop of Armagh from 1444 to 1456,[2] made provision for the maintenance of a number of priests to pray for the souls of himself and his predecessors.[3] His contemporary, Richard Talbot, Archbishop of Dublin, adopted a different arrangement, as he founded a chantry for the maintenance of six priests to pray for the king and himself and their successors.[4] When the Irish primates thus ignored the gospel, how could the people be expected to know that "being justified by faith we have peace with God"?

The lives of the dignitaries of the Church supply only too clear evidence that they had no right ideas as to the duties of Christ's ministers. The Archbishops of Armagh and Dublin were continually contending for pre-eminence; and the Primate of all Ireland apologized again and again for his absence from Parliament on the ground that he was not permitted to have his cross carried before him when he appeared in Leinster.[5] In 1442 a dispute occurred relative to the profits of the See of Raphoe, then vacant; and the Dean and Chapter, in consequence, became extremely obnoxious to the metropolitan. This arch prelate, whose name was John Prene, not content with excommunicating the offenders, granted forty days' indulgence to all who should fall upon their persons and dissipate their substance.[6] A bishop in the English settlements appears to have been considered rather as a civil than a

[1] Gilbert's *Viceroys*, p. 403. In the thirteenth century we find the Mayor of Dublin and the clergy disputing respecting the allowance of wax lights. The clergy insisted on using a large quantity of light in funeral processions. See Malone's *Church History of Ireland*, pp. 168-9.

[2] He was promoted to this See by the Pope. His twelve predecessors, commencing with John Taaf in 1305, all received their appointments from the Pope. See Cotton's *Fasti*, iii. 14-16.

[3] Harris's *Ware*, i. 86.

[4] *Ibid.* i. 338.

[5] *Ibid.* i. 85, 86.

[6] *Ibid.* i. 273-4.

spiritual dignitary; and hence not a few of the rulers of the Church were engaged in employments which would have been much more suitable for diplomatists, or lawyers, or military officers. One or other of them often acted as viceroy; and it was nothing extraordinary to hear of a Bishop or an Archbishop marching at the head of the troops, and mingling in the conflicts of the battle-field.[1] In 1475, when William Sherwood, Bishop of Meath, was viceroy, and when he was requested by a section of the Colonial Parliament to repair to England on public business, he pleaded he was "so much occupied in the field with hostings" that he could not, even for a time, quit the camp without damage to the English settlements.[2] At a somewhat earlier date, or in 1447, when Sir John Talbot retired from the viceroyalty, the government of the country was entrusted to his brother, Richard, Archbishop of Dublin, who had distinguished himself in various expeditions against the border Irish.[3] In 1444, Cormac MacCoughlan, Bishop of Clonmacnois, fell in a battle fought in the parish of Gillen, in King's County. Before the commencement of the engagement, the Right Reverend warrior appears to have been very sure of victory, as the annalist informs us that "the Bishop would not allow [the enemy] the cessation of one day, nor of that night neither."[4]

When noticing the battle which led to the death of this champion of the Church Militant, the chronicler reveals some

[1] See Macgeoghegan's *Hist. of Ireland*, pp. 352, 357. Malone, p. 313.

[2] Gilbert's *Viceroys*, p. 400. In addition to the military exactions of Coyne and Livery were "*Rising out*, *Bonagh*, and *Soren*" reported as "services made unto the King"—*Rising out* being levies of horsemen and kerne; *Bonagh*, allowance for their payment by the Irishry; and *Soren*, an additional exaction for meat, drink and lodging. *Carew MSS.* 1601-3, pp. 454-5. In old title deeds a proportional share of the "risings out" is mentioned as to be provided by the lessee.

[3] Gilbert's *Viceroys*, p. 352. Richard Talbot had been at this time Archbishop for thirty years. See Harris's *Ware*, i. 338. Documents of an earlier date are "still on record which treat 'De castris Archiepiscopi Dublinensis reparandis,' (*Lib. Mun.*, vol. i., part iv., p. 14) and in which Edward] III. threatens to take the archbishop's castles into his own hands, if His Grace should delay to fortify them."—Brady's *English State Church in Ireland*, p. 6.

[4] *Annals of Ireland*, from 1443 to 1468, p. 204. Terence O'Brien, who was Bishop of Killaloe from 1482 to 1525, was another fighting prelate. See Harris's *Ware*, i. 594.

facts[1] which show how little the Irish clergy of the fifteenth century respected the law of celibacy. "*Two sons of the Archdeacon* Mac-Coughlan," says he, "were killed on the bog northward next Toomoling, and James, *the bishop's son, Archdeacon of* Clonmacnoise." Here we find an Archdeacon with two sons, and a Bishop who confers high ecclesiastical rank on his own illegitimate offspring. The annalist who has left the record, and who was probably a monk himself, appears to have seen nothing very reprehensible in these details; for he closes his account of the transaction with an eulogy on the Right Reverend dignitary who was slain in the engagement. "A common giver to all the clergy of Ireland," says he, "and a special true friend to all the learned in the Irish liberal sciences in Ireland also was that *eminent Lord Bishop*."[2] The history of the times abundantly attests that the chief pastor of Clonmacnois was only walking in the footsteps of too many of his episcopal brethren. Donald, who was Bishop of Derry from 1423 to 1429, was more than once under discipline for incontinence.[3] When the fact was proved against him, instead of being deprived of his See, he was merely put under a course of penance. John Pain, Bishop of Meath, was accused, in the king's presence, of gross licentiousness by the Earl of Kildare.[4] John Cely, who was Bishop of Down from 1413 to 1441, created great scandal by his immorality. He lived openly for years with another man's wife. Had he behaved with ordinary decency after he was first called to account, he might have escaped degradation; but he pertinaciously refused to separate from his paramour, and he was in

[1] *Annals of Ireland*, from 1443 to 1468, p. 204. This chronicle again and again bears testimony, quite incidentally, to the incontinence of the monks and clergy. Thus we read of "the Abbot of Muirgeas, *son to the Abbot* MacDonaghy," p. 202. Among Irishmen who visited Rome in 1444 the annalist mentions "William, *son to the Dean* O'Flanagan," and "John, *son to the Abbot* McDavid," p. 206. We read again of "Redmond, son to the Prior Fitz Loghlin," p. 256; and "James, *son to the Bishop* Richard," p. 261. Illegitimacy, it appears, did not then disqualify even a metropolitan; as we read that in 1450 "the Archbishop of Connaught [*i.e.* of Tuam] *son of the parson*, son to Mac-Johnine Bourke, died in Galway." P. 227. *Irish Archæol. Miscellany*, vol. i. Dublin, 1846.

[2] He was Bishop of Clonmacnois from 1427 to 1444. In 1568 Clonmacnois was united to Meath by Act of Parliament. See Cotton's *Fasti*, iii. 133.

[3] Harris's *Ware*, i. 290.

[4] *Ibid.* i. 152.

consequence deprived of his bishopric.[1] O'Hedian, Archbishop of Cashel, seems to have been an offender of the same type. Thirty articles of impeachment were preferred against him by the Bishop of Lismore and Waterford, one of which presents a startling idea of the low tone of morality which prevailed at this period. His Grace was accused, not merely of keeping a concubine, but of decorating her with a valuable ring which had been given as an oblation to the Church by the Earl of Desmond, and which had been placed on the finger of an image of Patrick, the apostle of Ireland.[2] The desecration of the ring appears to have been regarded as a far worse offence in the Archbishop than the sin of fornication.

We have seen that the military orders obtained a footing in Ireland immediately after the English invasion, and that Strongbow founded at Kilmainham a priory for the Knights Templars.[3] Such an institute must have been quite to the taste of the rough soldier who came into the country on a military speculation; and who sought by craft, violence, and oppression, to establish his dynasty in Leinster. He no doubt expected that the Knights would strengthen the foundations of his house; and be at hand, when their services were required, to do battle for the family of their founder. When the Templars were suppressed in the beginning of the fourteenth century,[4] the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem succeeded to their possessions; and the Priory of Kilmainham continued to flourish.[5] Its prior had a seat in Parliament; he was one of the most influential grandees in Ireland; and he acted occasionally as viceroy.[6] But he often sadly belied

---

[1] *Ibid.* i. 202. See also the case of Laurence O'Gallagher, Bishop of Raphoe, who bestowed certain of the See lands on his concubine. O'Donovan's *Annals of the Four Masters*, iv. p. 1069, *note.* See also iv. p. 1212; and p. 1253, *note.*

[2] Harris's *Ware*, i. 481. "The charges preferred against O'Hedian never seem to have been disproved. His accuser, the Bishop of Lismore and Waterford, was celebrated for his piety and learning."—Harris's *Ware*, i. 535.

[3] See p. 242. [4] See p. 272.

[5] Kilmainham means *the church of Maighneann.* Maighneann is said to have been an ancient Irish bishop. Gilbert's *Viceroys*, p. 123.

[6] See Dowling's *Annals*, A.D. 1327 and A.D. 1410. See also Gilbert, p. 123.

the character of a monk and a churchman. We find him mixed up with not a few of the most disreputable proceedings of the times—acting sometimes far more like a leader of banditti than a soldier of Christ. About the year 1474 Sir Robert Dowdall, Deputy Treasurer and Justice of the King's Bench, complained that, when going on a pilgrimage, he had been assaulted by James Keating, Prior of Kilmainham, with a drawn sword, and put in danger of his life; and that his assailant would not appear on any process to answer for his conduct. When fined, the Prior contrived, on technical grounds, to evade the penalty—pleading that he had been obliged to go to England on public business of importance. Keating was as bold as he was unscrupulous; and was ready to beard even the government, when he had any hope of escaping with impunity. There was at this time in Ireland an Italian, named Marcello, a Roman Doctor of Laws, who, by his disorderly conduct, had attracted the notice of the Irish Parliament. He probably came here on a mission from the Pope, as otherwise we cannot account for the influence he evidently wielded. But, like too many agents sent from Rome, he soon approved himself an unmitigated scoundrel. He managed to create such strife between the Dean of St. Patrick's, Dublin, and the Chapter, that it was impracticable for some time to keep up the cathedral service; and he was equally successful in promoting contention between the Archbishop of Armagh and the Bishop of Meath. He was a very loose liver; and, when such a man is exalted, the wicked walk on every side. On one occasion he broke open the ecclesiastical jail[1] at Termonfeckan, near Drogheda, and liberated one of his Irish followers, named Hugh O'Mellan, who lay there in chains under a charge of robbery.[2] His

The Prior of Kilmainham is described as "the most extensive possessor of land among the ecclesiastics," (MALONE, p. 366) and as "the most powerful baron of the Pale." (RICHEY'S *Lectures*, ii. 65.)

[1] Gilbert's *Viceroys*, p. 397.

[2] As prelates had now the power of imprisonment, they had places of confinement under their own control. The Archbishop of Dublin had the rights of a prince palatine within his liberties, and a gallows for the execution of criminals within a mile of his palace, at a place called *Harold's-cross*. Harris's *Ware*, i. 300. See also O'Conor's *Hist. Address*, part i., pp. 96, 97.

[3] Gilbert, p. 398.

behaviour had been so outrageous that he had been ordered by statute to leave Ireland in a month, and never to return on pain of being punished as a traitor. Penalties were also decreed against any who might harbour him. But the Prior of Kilmainham cared little for the threats of an Act of Parliament. Keating took Marcello under his protection; and the State permitted this act of the stout-hearted Knight of St. John of Jerusalem to pass unpunished. Soon afterwards we find Keating engaged in a more perilous adventure. At a political crisis he assumed the command of the Castle of Dublin, having first dispossessed the lawful governor; and, after demolishing the bridge, he immediately fortified the place against Henry, Lord Grey, then recently appointed Deputy Viceroy of Ireland.[1] Nor were these the only crimes and misdemeanours with which Keating stood chargeable. It was alleged that he had mortgaged or sold several articles of great value belonging to the priory, and, among the rest, a piece of the wood of the true Cross; and that he had alienated, or encumbered with pensions, the revenues of the establishment.[2] In 1482 he was set aside as prior by the Grand Master of Rhodes; and an Englishman of noble birth, named Lomley, was chosen his successor. But Keating still refused to yield. As soon as he received notice of the arrival of Lomley at Clontarf, he hastened thither with a band of armed partisans; made a prisoner of the new prior; and kept him in close confinement until he compelled him to give up his credentials and all the documents relating to his appointment. He attempted at the same time to propitiate the stranger, by conferring on him a subordinate command connected with the knights at Kilsaran, in the county of Louth. Lomley indignantly complained to the King and the Grand Master; and Keating was, in consequence, excommunicated. He had been so long accustomed to trifle with the authorities of Church and State, that he made light of this censure; but he was determined that Lomley should feel the weight of his displeasure. Proceeding to Kilsaran, he seized his unhappy victim; bound him in chains; and threw

[1] Gilbert, p. 404; Brenan, p. 372.

[2] Macgeoghegan, p. 367.

him into prison, where he lingered till his death. For nine years after his deposition Keating kept possession of the Priory of Kilmainham; and had he not taken a prominent part in Simnel's rebellion, he might have retained his dignity for life.[1] But his conduct on that occasion was declared unpardonable. He was then obliged to save himself by flight; and he ended his days some time afterwards in circumstances of extreme indigence.[2]

The Irish ecclesiastical dignitaries of the fifteenth century acted too often on the principle that the Church exists for the benefit of the clergy—not the clergy for the benefit of the Church. Though the Bishops so grossly neglected their spiritual duties, and though, for years together, some of them were not to be seen in their dioceses,[3] they did not neglect the collection of their revenues, neither did they fail to exact scrupulously those tokens of outward distinction to which they deemed themselves entitled. An Irish Parliament held at Trim in 1447 enacted that no equestrian, beneath the rank of a Knight or a Bishop, should use a gilt bridle or "any other gilt harness."[4] On the death of a suffragan, the Archbishop of Armagh claimed the best horse, cup, and ring of the deceased prelate;[5] and it is not improbable that other metropolitans made similar demands. The avarice of the higher clergy was too gross to escape general observation. When the government of the Church was administered by men of a character so secular, it was to be expected that simony would abound. The Papal Court was the great

---

[1] Leland, ii. 72.

[2] *Ibid*, ii. 89; Brenan, p. 373.

[3] Foxall, Archbishop of Armagh, who died in England the second year after his consecration, never visited his diocese. Harris's *Ware*, i. 87. Harris believes that Scrope, who was Bishop of Dromore from 1434 to 1440, never resided in his See. *Ibid.* i. 262. *Ware* mentions three other Bishops of Dromore who were never in Ireland. *Ibid.* i. 264. In the latter part of the fifteenth century the bishopric of Kilmore was claimed by two persons; and it appears that, in 1495, both sat as Bishops of Kilmore in a Synod held at Drogheda. *Ibid.* i. 229; Macgeoghegan, p. 370. Many of the parochial clergy at this time lived abroad; and in 1458 the Irish Parliament found it necessary to pass an Act (the 36th of Henry VI., chap. i.), "that beneficed persons keep residence."

[4] The 25th of Henry VI., chap. vi.

[5] Harris's *Ware*, i. 185, 253.

market in which spiritual preferments were bought and sold: the traffic was carried on with unblushing effrontery; and heavy debts were contracted in the purchase of bishoprics and archbishoprics. In a Parliament opened at Drogheda in 1467 it was enacted that no Bulls should be bought at the Court of Rome for the possession of livings.[1] But the evil was too deeply rooted to be removed by such legislation. The fees now paid to the Papal officials, by every one who obtained ecclesiastical advancement, were most oppressive. An archbishopric was a rich prize; and a refined system of extortion was brought to bear on the successful candidate. Bull after bull was made necessary to complete his title;[2] so that for years after the date of his promotion the new metropolitan was often obliged to struggle with pecuniary embarrassment. Edmund Connesburgh, who was made Archbishop of Armagh in 1477, soon found himself in a state of insolvency. He was so tardy in paying for his Bulls, that the Pope became uneasy, and contemplated his deposition; but a crafty Italian named Octavian, who had more ample funds at command, took advantage of his difficulties, and relieved him at once of his debts and of the Primacy. Connesburgh engaged to resign his See into the hands of the Pope; and Octavian bound himself, as soon as he obtained peaceable possession of the Archbishopric, to discharge all the monetary obliga-

[1] The 7th of Edward IV., chap. ii. This Statute declares "that whatsoever man of holy church purchase any manner of dignity, parsonage, or vicarage, by Bulls of the Pope to hold in commendam, and the said Bulls, dignities, parsonages, or vicarages accept, they shall be out of the protection of the king, and forfeit the value of the said benefices during his life natural . . . . and shall incur all penalties of the statutes or ordinances made against provisors."

[2] No less than eleven separate Bulls were issued for the consecration of Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, in the following century. "By one Bull he is, upo the King's nomination, promoted to be Archbishop of Canterbury—which is directed to the King; by a second, directed to himself, he is made archbishop. By a third he is absolved from all censures; a fourth is to the suffragans; a fifth to the Dean and Chapter; a sixth to the clergy of Canterbury; a seventh to all the laity in his diocese; an eighth to all that held lands in his diocese; by a ninth he was ordered to be consecrated; by a tenth . . . . the pallium was sent to him; by an eleventh the Archbishop of York and Bishop of London were required to put it on him."—Burnet's *History of the Reformation*, vol. i., p. 209. London, 1841.

tions which his predecessor had contracted at Rome when he obtained the dignity, as well as to secure to him for life a comfortable pension.[1] Octavian enjoyed his elevation thirty-three years;[2] and though the simoniacal contract was entered in a public registry, and could scarcely have been unknown to the Pope himself, it was permitted to pass unchallenged.

The revenues of vacant sees were claimed by the Crown, and sometimes largely replenished the coffers of the Irish Viceroy. But in districts where the "mere Irish" predominated, other parties—such as deans and chapters—often managed to obtain a share of the spoil. The death of a dignitary led to keen competition for his office; the Pope and the King contended for the right of nomination; and the candidate who had money to distribute could scarcely fail to make a favourable impression on the courtiers or the cardinals. Those who meanwhile enjoyed the emoluments were ready to devise pretexts for deferring the appointment. Many complaints were made of the delays which occurred in the filling up of bishoprics and archbishoprics—nor were these complaints without foundation. On one occasion the Archbishopric of Cashel was vacant no less than ten years.[3]

When treating of the history of the twelfth century we have described the steps by which the transition from congregational to diocesan episcopacy was accomplished; and we have seen that the Synod of Kells found it necessary to modify the arrangements adopted by the Synod of Rathbreasail. The twenty-six Sees established in 1110 were increased to thirty-eight in 1152.[4] The promoters of the new polity were obliged to submit to the augmentation, that they might conciliate parties dissatisfied with the change: but they looked with little favour on this addition to the prelates, as they were aware that the erection of comparatively small

---

[1] Harris's *Ware*, i. 88.

[2] From A.D. 1480 to A.D. 1513. No wonder that poor churchmen were sometimes in a state of embarrassment for years after an appointment to an archbishopric; as the pallium occasionally cost what was equal to £30,000 of our money. See Wordsworth's *Church of Ireland*, p. 96, *note*.

[3] That is from 1440 to 1450. Harris's *Ware*, i. 481; Cotton's *Fasti*, i. 9.

[4] See before, p. 207.

bishoprics tended to diminish the wealth and splendour of the hierarchy. As soon as circumstances permitted, some of the existing Sees were suppressed. As early as 1210 Mayo was annexed to Tuam.[1] About the year 1324 the Archbishops of Dublin and Cashel, and the Bishop of Cork were commissioned by the Pope to make inquiries with a view to what was rather equivocally designated "the reformation" of the ecclesiastical state of the country; and, at a provincial council held immediately afterwards, it was agreed that "the small and poor bishoprics, not exceeding £20, £40, or £60 a year, and which were governed by the mere Irish . . . should be united to the more eminent archbishoprics and bishoprics."[2] At the time when this synod was held, one pound sterling was equivalent to twentyfold the same nominal amount in our days;[3] so that the Sees here mentioned must have been worth from £400 to £1,200 a year of our present currency. Such an income seems to have contented the "mere Irish" dignitaries; but it was spurned by a more aspiring English or Italian churchman. The duties of office did not much encumber these high-flown functionaries; and they found it very convenient to effect a combination of salaries. The Pope himself inaugurated the work of amalgamation. We learn that about 1325 he "thought proper to annex the three cathedrals of Enaghdune,[4] Achonry, and Kilmacduagh to the metropolitical church of Tuam."[5] He had, however, good reason to know that the measure would be disrelished in Ireland; and he accordingly

[1] Brenan, p. 301. Mayo was afterwards a separate See. See Cotton's *Fasti*, iv. 50.

[2] Harris's *Ware*, i. 560; King's *Primer*. Suppl. vol. pp. 1179-80.

[3] See Hallam's *Middle Ages*, chap. ix., part ii. In these days the salary of the Irish Lord Lieutenant was only £500 per annum.—Gilbert's *Viceroys*, p. 321. Hallam says:—"We may perhaps consider any given sum under Henry III. and Edward I. (1216-1307) as equivalent, in general command over commodities, to about twenty-four or twenty-five times their nominal value at present."—*Middle Ages*, vol. iii., p. 369. London, 1855.

[4] As to the See of Enaghdune, see before, p. 247, *note* (5). In A.D. 1250 it was stated that "the church of Enaghdune was but a *parish church* belonging to the Archbishopric of Tuam." See *The Unity of the Anglican Church*, by Archdeacon Stopford, p. 13.

[5] Harris's *Ware*, i. 560. A Bull authorising this union, and dated July 1327, may be found in Theiner's *Vetera Monumenta*, p. 239.

endeavoured to keep it concealed from the Bishops and Chapters of the Sees to be extinguished. Even the King of England complained that he was not consulted as to an arrangement which should not have been made without his sanction.[1] Enaghdune was soon appended to Tuam, as the Pope had proposed; but the rest of the scheme miscarried.[2]

Though Achonry and Kilmacduagh maintained a separate existence for some centuries, other dioceses yielded to the process of consolidation. In 1363 Waterford and Lismore were united.[3] In the early part of the fifteenth century Miles Fitz-John, Bishop of Cork, and Adam Pay, Bishop of Cloyne, died in the same year; and in 1431, a junction, previously contemplated, was effected by the appointment of Jordan, Chancellor of Limerick, as the Bishop of these two Sees.[4] Shortly after the Synod of Rathbreasail, Malachy O'Morgair complained of the union of Down and Connor; and separated, as his biographer tells us, the two parishes "which ambition had joined into one:"[5] but, after the lapse of three hundred years, they were again associated. The union, which took place in 1442, has not since been dissolved.

The annexation of Enaghdune to Tuam created much dissatisfaction. The most influential inhabitants of the extinguished diocese were of English extraction; they were surrounded by the "mere Irish;" and as they had long been under the care of an English Bishop, they complained bitterly when the See was suppressed. After remaining for a time in a state of smothered discontent, they resolved on a more

---

[1] Harris's *Ware*, i. 560.

[2] In the beginning of the seventeenth century Killala and Achonry were united: as were Kilmacduagh and Clonfert about the same period.—Cotton's *Fasti*, iv. 67, 166.

[3] Harris's *Ware*, i. 554. In Theiner's *Vetera Monumenta*, p. 238, there is a Bull for their union, dated July 1327, but at that time it would appear that the Pope failed to accomplish it.

[4] In 1583, Cork, Cloyne and Ross were united by appointment of William Lyon as bishop of these three Sees.—Harris's *Ware*, i. 565, 588. In 1638 Cloyne became again a separate diocese.—Cotton, i. 225, 293.

[5] See before, p. 333. It is noteworthy here that the word *parochia*, which originally denoted much the same as our modern *parish*, continued for some time to be applied to the sphere of the Bishop's jurisdiction after he became a diocesan.

decided opposition, and the Bishop of Enaghdune again makes his appearance in ecclesiastical history.[1] By way of compromise, the Pope at length, in 1484, consented to the appointment of a warden and eight vicars for the collegiate church of Galway. The warden and his assistants were to be chosen by the mayor and citizens.[2] Galway was the chief town of the old diocese of Enaghdune; its inhabitants were generally of English extraction; and they consented to accept a warden, as a substitute for a Bishop.[3] It deserves notice that in the arrangements relating to the appointment of the warden and vicars, the right of the people to elect their own ecclesiastical instructor was distinctly recognised.[4]

Though Ireland was now in a state so distracted, and though very few districts were long free from the ravages of war, conventual establishments continued to spring up here and there all over the country. The protests of Fitzralph against the begging friars in the century preceding do not appear to have produced any considerable impression,[5] as the monasteries now erected were almost all connected with the mendicant orders. The Dominicans obtained settlements at Galway, Portumna, Longford, Thomastown, and elsewhere: among the Franciscan convents now founded, may be mentioned those of Askeaton, Enniscorthy, Bantry, Adaire, Donegal, and Dungannon: the Augustinians established themselves at Naas, Callan, and other places: and houses were built for the Carmelites at Ramullan in the County of

[1] See King's *Primer*. Suppl. vol. 1182, 1188; Cotton's *Fasti*, iv. 55.

[2] The Bull from Pope Innocent VIII. was obtained through the exertions of "black" Dominick Lynch, whose brother Peter became the first Mayor of Galway. —Gilbert's *Viceroys*, p. 420. See also Theiner's *Vetera Monumenta*, p. 492-3; and Hardiman's *History of Galway*, app. ii.-vi.

[3] Brenan, pp. 368-9. In their petition to the Pope on this occasion the inhabitants of Galway stated that the surrounding natives were a savage race, by whom they were often disturbed when performing their religious services "*according to the English rite and custom.*"—Hardiman's *Galway*, p. 68. Dublin, 1820.

[4] The arrangement made at this time was long observed in Galway. About forty years ago the Roman Catholic wardenship was changed into a bishopric.

[5] Philip Norris, Dean of St. Patrick's, Dublin, who died in 1465, strenuously supported the views of Fitzralph. He maintained also that, as the Pope was fallible, he was subject to a general council.—*Malone*, pp. 319, 320.

Donegal, at Cork, and at Frankfort in King's County, as well as at Galway.[1]

The convent of Donegal, founded in 1474 by Odo Roe, Prince of Tyrconnel, for strict observants of the Franciscan order, is said to have had the best selected library in the kingdom.[2] It may, after all, have been very miserably furnished with literary works; as, in the fifteenth century, Ireland was one of the most barbarous countries in Europe. And the history of these religious foundations should teach one lesson of very grave significance. It shows clearly that an imposing ecclesiastical edifice is no evidence whatever of spiritual enlightenment.[3] Some of the most beautiful structures that Ireland ever saw were reared in the days of her deep degeneracy. The religion of mere ritualism seeks rather to strike the senses and dazzle the imagination than to enlighten the intellect and impress the heart. A monk may walk on a marble pavement, and gaze daily on a richly decorated shrine, and withal may know nothing of the true way of holiness and comfort. The appearance of new and ornamental convents at this period did not necessarily indicate the moral and spiritual improvement of the country.[4] The way of life is exhibited in the word of the truth of the Gospel; and that word was now ignored. The building of a splendid abbey was supposed to atone for a career of ungodliness; and the magnificence of the structure might only betoken the exuberant wealth and the gross superstition of the founder.

[1] Brenan, pp. 377-383.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 381. The reader will recollect that, in this convent, the *Annals of the Four Masters* were compiled in the early part of the seventeenth century.

[3] It must, however, be remembered that very shortly after the date of the English invasion, even the style of our national architecture began to degenerate. See Stokes's *Life of Petrie*, p. 299.

[4] Whilst a few new monasteries were now erected, others fell into decay. We find a contemporary Cistercian abbot giving a doleful account of Irish monasteries in the century immediately preceding the Reformation. "*No hospitality* was practised. The funds were at the disposal of laics. As a natural consequence, *the monks wandered about in search of the necessaries of life.* Divine service was neglected. The monastic dress was laid aside. The monks lived among the nobility. Those called abbots were not consecrated. And such as were consecrated *scarcely once a year visited their houses.*"—MALONE'S *Church History of Ireland*, p. 376.

Architecture is a noble art, but it may flourish among the worshippers of Juggernaut;[1] and it should not be forgotten that some of the fairest religious edifices ever reared in Ireland were erected by such men as Earl Strongbow, or John de Courcy, or Richard Ledred, or Richard O'Hedian.[2]

The monks of various orders who appeared in Ireland after the beginning of the twelfth century were all, as we have seen, deeply pledged to the support of the Papacy. The more ancient establishments, erected by Patrick and his immediate successors, soon entirely passed away; and their places were supplied by institutes of a quite different character.[3] At a time when there was no printing press to impart instruction, and when the ordinary parish priests rarely or never addressed their congregations from the pulpit,[4] the preaching friars were able, to a great extent, to control public opinion. It is not, therefore strange that, in the course of two or three hundred years, Ireland became intensely popish. The circumstances of the country were otherwise favourable to the advancement of pontifical authority. The English were deeply detested by many of the natives; but, as both parties recognised the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome, frequent applications for redress of grievances were made to his tribunal. He had, indeed, handed over the Irish to Anglo-Saxon rule; and they could never think of the loss of their ecclesiastical, as well as of their national freedom, without a pang of indignation; but still the Pope could now interfere authoritatively between them and the British monarch; and they found that, in a multitude of cases, they did not appeal to him in vain. As often as he could safely insist on

---

[1] See before, p. 242, *note* (1).

[2] O'Hedian rebuilt the Cathedral of Cashel, and otherwise distinguished himself by his architectural improvements. As to his character see before, p. 310.

[3] See Richey's *Lectures on the History of Ireland*, second series, p. 63. London, 1870.

[4] In a state paper, drawn up in the reign of Henry VIII, we meet with the following passage:—"Some sayeth that the prelates of the Church and clergy is much cause of all the misorder of the land; for there is no archbishop, ne bishop, abbot, ne prior, parson, ne vicar, ne any other person of the Church, high or low, great or small, English or Irish, that useth to preach the Word of God saving the poor friars beggars."—*The State of Ireland and the plan of its Reformation.*

the submission of the King of England, he was ready to embrace the opportunity. When a Bishop or a priest complained of the interference of the civil power, the Pope was sure to decide in favour of ecclesiastical authority. When the clergy of a diocese were opposed to the appointment of an English prelate, he was prepared to join them in support of another candidate. By encouraging the natives to insist on the promotion of their countrymen, he could at once set aside the nominations of the crown, and add greatly to his own influence with the mass of the Irish people. By adhering steadily to this policy he at length induced the state to give up the struggle as hopeless; and he then found little difficulty in prevailing on the local clergy to surrender to himself their share of the ecclesiastical patronage. In the fifteenth century almost all the higher Church appointments in Ireland were at his disposal. Of thirty-two episcopal promotions which then took place in Leinster, not less than thirty were arranged by him;[1] and, in the other provinces his power was absolute.[2] Nor was he content with exercising the privilege of nomination when places became vacant. By what was called the "method of provisors," he anticipated the demise of those who held dignified or lucrative offices, and filled up their places prospectively.[3] Even in such cases—where the chances of survivorship were involved—the nominations were not obtained for nothing.[4] The state of the health of a rich dignitary was often a matter of much interest to ecclesiastical expectants, and obituary reports were circulated with speed and believed with avidity. So keen was the competition for

---

[1] Brenan, p. 375.

[2] In 1482 the people of Waterford refused to receive Nicholas O'Henisa, the Bishop nominated by the Pope, on the ground that he did not understand English; but the Pope over-ruled the objection, and ordered them to submit. See his Bull, dated December 1482, addressed to the Archbishop of Cashel, in Theiner's *Vetera Monumenta*, p. 487-8. Among the objectors was James Rice, a distinguished citizen, who "built a fair chapel in the Cathedral." See Ware's *Bishops of Waterford and Lismore.*

[3] It has been remarked that "at no time was the number of promotions by provision of the Pope *so remarkably great* as in *the latter years of the fifteenth century.*"—MALONE'S *Church History of Ireland*, p. 374.

[4] See Harris's *Ware*, i. 328.

preferments, and so anxious were the Roman officials for the fees which the succession to a lucrative dignity secured to them, that bulls were sometimes executed when sufficient proof was not forthcoming as to the actual occurrence of a vacancy; and when it was found afterwards that the costly instruments were useless, as the Bishop or Archbishop, whose place had been supplied, still lingered in the land of the living. In the latter part of the fifteenth century, Pope Sixtus IV. conferred the Archbishopric of Tuam on Walter Blake; but it was subsequently ascertained that Donat O'Murray, who was supposed to have been dead and buried, was yet forthcoming.[1] In England the power of the crown was sufficient to prevent the Pope from engrossing the Church patronage; but Ireland was in a quite different position. Here the government was weak; and the Bishop of Rome, during the period before us, nominated almost the whole of the dignified clergy, whether secular or regular. We thus see one grand reason why papal authority was so much more securely established in Ireland than in the sister country.

Whilst the great Pontiff was continually endeavouring to extend and consolidate his power in the Western Isle by encroaching on the royal prerogative, the King of England could not well afford to quarrel with so influential a personage; and he occasionally received from him most important and seasonable aid. When the question of allegiance was involved, the Pope sided invariably with the British monarch. As he had constituted Henry II. lord of Ireland, he felt bound to vindicate his policy by maintaining the title of the successors of that prince to the sovereignty of the kingdom. We have seen how he fulminated his excommunications against all who supported Edward Bruce; and during the fifteenth century he repeatedly signified his determination to sustain the Anglo-Irish government. The colonists reckoned so confidently on his sympathy, that, in a Parliament held in 1421, they petitioned the King to request Martin V. to

[1] Harris's *Ware*, i. 174, 613. In 1463 an attempt was made, by means of forged documents, to force a co-adjutor on Jordan, Bishop of Cork and Cloyne. See *Ware*, i. 562; and Brady's *Clerical and Parochial Records of Cork, Cloyne and Ross*, iii. 43. London, 1864.

organize a crusade against their Irish enemies.[1] That Pontiff had too much prudence to sanction so atrocious a proposal; but he freely permitted the clergy to employ the terrors of the Church on behalf of Anglican ascendency. Among the laws made, in a Parliament held at Dublin in 1467, the following extraordinary enactment appears:—"Whereas our Holy Father Adrian, Pope of Rome, was possessed of all the seigniory of Ireland, in right of his Church, which for a certain rent he alienated to the King of England and his heirs for ever, and by which grant the people of Ireland owe their obedience to the King of England, as their sovereign lord — it is therefore ordained that all Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland shall, upon the monition of forty days, proceed to the excommunication of all disobedient subjects; and if such Archbishops or Bishops be remiss in discharging their duty in the premises, they shall henceforth be liable to a penalty of one hundred pounds."[2] When Lambert Simnel set up a claim to the throne, the Pope himself appeared on the scene, and issued a bull excommunicating all his abettors. Nor did ecclesiastical interference stop here. Every Archbishop, Bishop, abbot, and prior, who had joined in the rebellion of Simnel, signed a formula pledging himself, as often as he was lawfully required, to "execute the censures of the Church by the authority of the Holy Father, Pope Inno-

---

[1] Gilbert, pp. 314-5; Leland, ii. 14.

[2] Brenan, p. 365; Leland, ii. 56. The sentence of excommunication was now not unfrequently inflicted on very slight grounds. It was denounced against those who indulged in a certain pastime, called hurling, on Easter Monday, as well as against all *who hunted a hare on Good Friday!*—Malone, pp. 323, 324. The sentence itself was sufficiently startling. In a provincial council, held in 1460, the following form of excommunication was employed:—"All those who seized or concealed any of the goods of the Archbishop of Armagh, or attacked his manor, we excommunicate, anathematize, and remove from the precincts of the Church, deliver to Satan, and to his ministers for the destruction of the flesh: we render them accursed whether standing, sitting, walking, sleeping, waking, talking, or silent, eating, drinking and in everything they do: that their society may be of those who said, 'Depart from us, O Lord, since we deserve not the knowledge of your ways.' So be it. So be it. Amen."—*Register of Palatian*, Malone, p. 362. The *New Testament* teaches us to treat even the excommunicated compassionately (2 Thess. iii. 15); but this sentence breathes a spirit of the bitterest hatred.

cent VIII., and by his bull given under lead, against all those of his subjects, of what dignity, degree, state, or condition they might be, that disturbed or troubled their sovereign lord, or his title to the crown of England and lordship of Ireland."[1]

When a Church becomes a mere machine of State it loses its dignity, and forfeits its claim to the confidence of the Christian people. The Irish were now led blindfold by ignorance and superstition; and yet their instincts sometimes prompted them to rebel against their spiritual bondmasters. There were cases in which the chieftains refused flatly to submit to ecclesiastical discipline; and in 1425 Prince Owen O'Neill, of Ulster, was with difficulty induced to consent to recognize the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Armagh.[2] In 1444, when John Mey became Primate of all Ireland,[3] he could not obtain admission to his diocese until he consented to pay to O'Neill an annual tribute of so many yards of cloth of various descriptions; and thus the Northern chieftain provided for himself and his family a supply of suitable apparel at the expense of the metropolitan.[4] Temporal and spiritual peers were often at deadly enmity; and civilians sometimes evinced very little respect for churchmen. On one occasion the Earl of Kildare, the Archbishop of Cashel, and others, had a bitter altercation in the presence of Henry VII. The prelate charged his lordship with burning the principal church in his metropolitan city. The King turned to the earl, and sternly asked if he had done so. "No doubt," replied Kildare; "but I would never have thought of it, had I not been told that the Archbishop was within."[5] "The King," says the narrator of this incident, "merrily laughed at the plainness of the man, to see him allege that intent for excuse which most of all did aggravate his fault."

---

[1] Brenan, p. 367.

[2] Gilbert's *Viceroys*, p. 322.

[3] Mey, who was Primate from 1444 to 1456, as the reader may recollect, was promoted by the Pope.—Cotton, iii. 16.

[4] Gilbert, p. 336; Malone, p. 326.

[5] Stanihurst, *De Rebus in Hibernia Gestis*, i. 51. On this occasion the Bishop of Meath is reported to have declared that "all Ireland could not rule this Earl." Henry is said to have replied, "Then this Earl shall rule all Ireland," and forthwith to have appointed him viceroy.

In 1415 Ireland was represented in the General Council of Constance. Patrick Ragged, Bishop of Cork, was present;[1] and Nicholas Fleming, Archbishop of Armagh, sent William Purcel to appear there as his proctor.[2] An event which occurred in the East, at a more advanced period of the century, created a profound sensation even in the British isles. Some of the pilgrims, who visited Rome in 1451 to celebrate the jubilee, did not return till two years afterwards; and they then brought with them the melancholy tidings that Constantinople had just been captured by the Turks.[3] This event was supposed to be the harbinger of unutterable woes to Christendom. Michael Tregury, Archbishop of Dublin, was so alarmed by the intelligence that he proclaimed a fast to be strictly kept throughout his diocese for three days together; granted indulgences of one hundred years[4] to the observers of it; and, clothed in sackcloth and ashes, walked to Christ Church before his clergy in solemn procession.[5] Recent occurrences were well fitted to inspire anxiety, for pestilence and famine had lately been sweeping away many of the people. In 1447 seven hundred ecclesiastics are said to have fallen victims to the plague.[6] Dublin suffered greatly from the terrible visitation.[7] Epidemics now proved very fatal; and one of the most disastrous on record ravaged the country a few years before the death of Henry VII.[8]

At this period the deepest darkness brooded over Western Christendom. Alexander VI., the reigning Pontiff, was a monster of iniquity; and multitudes of the Bishops followed too closely his example. The Church of Ireland, which once shone so brightly in the spiritual firmament, was now blank

---

[1] Cotton's *Fasti*, i. 220.

[2] Harris's *Ware*, i. 85.

[3] Constantinople fell in May 1453.

[4] There were instances in which the penance imposed extended far beyond the term of human life; and, in cases of this kind, such indulgences might meet the difficulty.

[5] Harris's *Ware*, i. 341.

[6] Some say 700 *priests*. See Haverty, p. 325. Nearly a century before, or in 1349, Ireland suffered dreadfully from a plague. See Clyn's *Annals*. Introd. vi. xxiv.

[7] "It is difficult to get an account of the *innumerable multitudes* that died in Dublin of that plague."—*Annals of Ireland*, from 1443 to 1468, p. 218.

[8] This plague, which visited the country in 1504-5, was followed by a famine.—*Macgeoghegan*, p. 378.

as a fallen star. The people were degraded and demoralized, and little above the condition of savages. There was no truth, nor mercy, nor knowledge of God in the land. Strangers had entered into her palaces, and devoured her pleasant fruits. Her chieftains were almost continually at war, "living in malice and envy, hateful and hating one another." Her independence was gone, and her Parliament was the merest mockery of a legislature. It represented only the English and Anglo-Irish of the Pale; and all its acts were dictated by the British government. She had now no Patrick to go everywhere throughout her borders preaching the Word; no Columbkille filled with the spirit of missionary enterprize; no Columbanus to protest against the errors of Rome. What could be expected from the lower orders of her clergy when so many of her Bishops wallowed in licentiousness, or girded on the sword and marched to the battle-field to fight for the enslavement of the people! Surely we have now reached the very midnight of Ireland's history. As we grope our way through her obscure annals, and as we see no signs of coming reformation, well may we ask, with the prophet, "O Lord, how long?" But this darkness is not to endure for ever. The light of a better day shall at length dawn; and though a cloudy and tempestuous morning may still hide the beams of the Great Luminary from many a lovely glen, all Ireland shall yet rejoice in His glorious radiance.

BOOK III.

FROM THE DEATH OF HENRY VII. TO THE DEATH OF JAMES I.

A.D. 1509 TO A.D. 1625.

CHAPTER I.

THE REIGN OF HENRY VIII. A.D. 1509 TO A.D. 1547.

IN the beginning of the reign of Henry VIII., the Earl of Kildare was Viceroy of Ireland. This nobleman died in 1513; and was succeeded in office by his son Gerald, who, for a few years afterwards, administered the government of the country. At this period the Pale was confined within very narrow limits. It embraced only about one half of the counties of Louth, Meath, Dublin, and Kildare:[1] and the majority of its inhabitants were an Irish-speaking population.[2] The territories of several of the great Irish, or Anglo-Irish chiefs, were not much inferior in geographical dimensions; and some of them ruled over districts even more extensive. The Earl of Kildare had vast estates, including some of the strongest castles in the kingdom; and so formidable was his influence, that he could embarrass the government itself when it ventured to provoke his opposition. The possessions of the Earl of Ormond extended over Tipperary and Kilkenny; the Earl of Desmond and his kinsmen had Kerry, Cork, Limerick, and Waterford;[3] and the head of the O'Neills claimed dominion over a large part of Ulster. These dynasts exercised the rights of sovereignty; their lands yielded little, if any, revenue to the Crown;[4] and the

[1] According to some, part of Wexford now belonged to the Pale. See Haverty, p. 349, *note.* Meath included Westmeath; and Dublin, Wicklow. See *Senchus Mor.*, vol. i., pref. v., *note.*

[2] Haverty, p. 349, *note.* See also Kelly's *Dissertations on Irish History*, p. 339, *note.* Dublin, 1864.

[3] Moore, iii. 252.

[4] *Ibid.* iii. 252.

viceroy had the merest shadow of authority within the bounds of their jurisdiction. They were very frequently at war with each other;[1] and they were ready, at any fitting opportunity, to renounce their allegiance to the King of England. Thomas Howard, Earl of Surrey,—who was Viceroy in 1520, and who was distinguished by the great ability of his administration—soon came to the conclusion that the island would require to be thoroughly subdued before it could be properly governed. He saw that no reliance whatever could be placed on the loyalty of most of the petty Irish potentates; and that they must all be stripped of their feudal privileges, before the country could be at peace. He was aware, indeed, of the difficulties attending such a subjugation of Ireland as that which he contemplated; he reckoned that it would encounter the most resolute and vigorous opposition; but he believed that a well-appointed army of 6,000 men would be sufficient for its accomplishment.[2] He proposed farther, that when, by the discipline of the sword, the kingdom was made perfectly amenable to English rule, it should be furnished with a new colony of English inhabitants.

It is very evident that the feeling of dissatisfaction with the British government, which existed in Ireland in the reign of Henry VIII., was not created by the ecclesiastical movements of that monarch. It was to be found in full force long before he came into collision with the Papacy. In 1517 the people rose in arms, even in the neighbourhood of Dublin—deluded, it is said, by some prediction that they were now to be delivered from the yoke of the stranger, and to enter on a new career of national glory.[3] In 1523 the Earl of Desmond negotiated a treaty with Francis I. of France, who was then meditating an invasion of Ireland.[4] The Munster chief

[1] Shortly before this time the laconic correspondence, so often quoted, took place between O'Neill, kinsman of the Lord Deputy Kildare, and O'Donnel, chieftain of Tyrconnel. "Send me tribute or else ——," was the message of O'Neill. "I owe you none, and if ——," was the reply.—Leland, ii. 91. In 1522 O'Neill and O'Donnel were engaged in sanguinary warfare.—Haverty, p. 351.

[2] Leland, ii. 130.

[3] *Ibid.* ii. 124-5. See also as to another meditated insurrection in 1521 in Haverty, pp. 348-9.

[4] Moore, iii. 240; Macgeoghegan, p. 389; Haverty, p. 353.

hoped thus to become supreme monarch of a portion of the island. Terdelach O'Brien, hereditary prince of Thomond, united with Desmond in this treaty.[1] In 1528 the same Earl of Desmond was engaged in another treasonable correspondence of a like character with Charles V., Emperor of Germany.[2] The Irish nobles, in various other ways, indicated the impatience with which they submitted to British authority. In 1531 an English cruiser captured a Spanish ship employed in fishing in the neighbourhood of Bantry Bay; but O'Sullivan,[3] the lord of the adjacent territory, captured both vessels; and, on the pretence that the rights of nations had been violated, hanged the Englishman, and set the Spaniard at liberty. Such proceedings attest that, long before the subject of religion began to divide the public mind, Ireland was in a very restless condition; and that some of the most powerful of the chiefs were prepared to ally themselves to any foreign potentate who could aid them effectually in the struggle for national independence.

But whilst English rule rested on a very insecure foundation, the Pope, in the beginning of the sixteenth century, had no reason whatever to anticipate any interference with his authority in Ireland. Some natives of South Britain, who had imbibed religious sentiments in advance of their age, passed over into this country in the reign of Henry VII., and their presence caused some little uneasiness; for in 1495 we find the

---

[1] Macgeoghegan, p. 389.

[2] Moore, iii. 260; Macgeoghegan, p. 392; Haverty, p. 353.

[3] Macgeoghegan, p. 393. "Before the English invasion the O'Sullivans had occupied rich tracts in the South-east of Tipperary; but being, like most of the old Irish families of Munster, expelled from their fertile valleys by the invaders, they retreated westward, and, preying on weaker tribes, took possession of the Western parts of Cork and Kerry. The wild and mountainous tracts around Bantry Bay, co-extensive with the barony of Bear and Bantry, were possessed by the O'Sullevan Bear down to the close of Elizabeth's reign."—Preface to *Hist. Cath. Ibern. Compend.*, p. v., by Professor Kelly. "The barony of Iveragh (except McCarthy More's estates), the entire of Dunkerion, and four plowlands in Glan-y-rought, were the allotment of O'Sullivan More. . . . O'Sullivan More gave one-third of his estate to his grandson, thence called McGillycuddy, *i.e.*, the child of my affections and of my goods; and his eldest son, and eventually most of his descendants, adopted that name, viz., McGillycuddy, in the stead of their ancient name of O'Sullivan."—BRADY'S *Cork, Cloyne and Ross*, vol. ii. 519.

Irish Parliament legislating against the growth of Lollardism and heresy;[1] but new ideas could make very slow progress among a people so destitute of knowledge, and in a state of such mental stagnation. Even the clergy—though possessed of all the literature in the land—were wretchedly ignorant. The bishops—who too frequently obtained their Sees by intrigue or violence,[2] or extravagant payments to the papal treasury[3]—were, in general, totally unworthy of their position; and so disorderly was the condition of the Church, that a laborious antiquary who flourished in the following century and who enjoyed special facilities for obtaining information, was unable, in many cases, to recover even the names of these obscure dignitaries.[4] The clergy had long claimed exemption from the jurisdiction of the civil courts;[5] and had often sadly abused the immunities which they had been permitted to enjoy.[6] They frequently suffered comparatively slight punishments for crimes which, if committed by laymen, would have brought down the heaviest penalties.[7] The state had all along protested against these class privileges; and the clergy had as strenuously insisted on their conservation. But the spirit of the times became more and more opposed to their continuance; and their removal one after another was the

---

[1] Leland, ii. 158; King, ii. 743.

[2] Leland, ii. 159.

[3] When Maurice Doran, who was Bishop of Leighlin from 1523 to 1525, was advised, after his promotion, to exact double subsidies from his clergy to meet the expenses of his election, he obtained much credit by returning for answer that "he would have his flock shorn, not flayed." Doran, who was a Dominican, is said to have been an eloquent preacher.—Cotton, ii. 387.

[4] See Ware's *Bishops of Dromore, Down and Connor, Ardfert, Killala, Achonry*, and others. Two Irish prelates were present at the Council of Lateran in 1512, viz., the Archbishop of Tuam and the Bishop of Leighlin.—Brenan, p. 390.

[5] A Synod, held in Limerick in 1453, decreed that ecclesiastics were not to be brought before secular tribunals. Malone, pp. 340-1. This was only a repetition of previous resolutions of the same character.

[6] Their oppressive exactions created bitter complaints. We find a bishop requiring a payment of £12 for the probate of a will when the whole property amounted only to £40; and priests demanding sixpence (equal to at least six shillings of our money), or a costly dinner for baptizing a child. See the *Annuary of the Royal Hist. and Arch. Association of Ireland* for the years 1868 and 1869, pp. 130, 133, 134.

[7] See Hallam's *Middle Ages*, ii. 222. London, 1855.

cause of much murmuring. In 1529 a provincial synod, over which Edmund Butler, Archbishop of Cashel,[1] presided, empowered the Mayor of Limerick to imprison ecclesiastical debtors until they had satisfied their creditors.[2] The mayor, it would appear, had been hitherto deterred, by the threat of excommunication, from proceeding against the dishonest churchmen; and the prelates who dictated the canons of the synod,[3] were, no doubt, induced, by the strong pressure of the government, to give him this authority.[4] But, when the clergy were made acquainted with the arrangement, they were thrown into a tempest of indignation; for they regarded the concession as a grievous infringement on their spiritual privileges.[5]

It is not here necessary to narrate the circumstances under which Henry VIII. threw off the yoke of Rome. Writers, blinded by the spirit of religious partisanship, have represented the English King as prompted merely by inordinate lust when he withdrew from the allegiance of the papacy. But the sober facts of history cannot be well accommodated to this theory. Henry was certainly not more licentious than his contemporary Pope Alexander VI.; and, had he simply desired to wallow in impurity, the Bishop of Rome would unquestionably not have interfered with his unbounded indulgence. Charles V., Francis I., and other sovereigns of the sixteenth century whom the Pope was in the habit of addressing as his "dear sons in Christ," were notorious for their violations of the Seventh Commandment.[6] Henry was by no means a strict moralist; and his numerous and unhappy marriages have entailed on him immense obloquy; but in separating from his first wife, he was sustained by the authority

[1] This prelate, who filled the See of Cashel from 1527 to 1551, was the illegitimate son of Peter, Earl of Ormond. *Ware*, i. 482.

[2] *Ware*, i., pp. 482-3.

[3] At this time the inferior clergy had no voice in the deliberations of Synods.

[4] The Archbishop who presided at this Synod was himself a Privy Councillor. *Ware*, i. 482.

[5] Macgeoghegan, p. 435.

[6] Pope Paul III. negotiated a marriage between an illegitimate daughter of Charles V. and Ottavio Farnese, the son of one of his own illegitimate children. See Ranke's *History of the Popes*, p. 64. Edition by Kelly. London, 1843.

of not a few of the best canonists in Europe; and the Roman Pontiff himself would at once have dissolved the union, had he not been restrained by the fear of giving offence to the Emperor of Germany. Neither can it be said that the Reformation in England was the work of Henry VIII. That prince continued to the end of his days an abettor of almost all the superstitions of Romanism. God can cause the wrath of man to praise Him; and the waywardness and folly of the British monarch were made subservient to the advancement of His glory. All Europe had for ages groaned under the tyranny of the Vatican; several states had already renounced the hated bondage; and though Henry's divorce from Catharine of Arragon was the occasion of his rupture with the Roman court, many of his subjects were already prepared to listen to the heralds of the Reformation. Had he not been sustained by a strong current of public opinion, even he could not have ventured to disown the papal supremacy.

Ireland was in no such state of preparation for the great ecclesiastical change as the sister kingdom. In England Henry was exceedingly popular in the beginning of his reign. His title to the throne was universally admitted; and he was recommended to his subjects by a handsome person, a pleasing address, a cultivated mind, and talents of a high order. They had confidence in his judgment; and when he renounced the jurisdiction of the Pope, multitudes who did not feel competent to form an opinion on the subject, were disposed to acquiesce in his decision.[1] Besides, a spirit of inquiry had already been awakened throughout England; and many here and there all over that country were inclined to listen eagerly to the views promulgated by Luther and Zwingle. But in Ireland it was otherwise. Here the King of England was regarded by the mass of the people as a foreign oppressor; the public mind was in a state of spiritual torpor; and very few had heard anything whatever of the great religious movement going forward on the continent. One of the earliest indications of the change in Ireland is furnished by a document

[1] Mr. Froude, by his late researches, as exhibited in his *History of England*, has thrown much additional light on the character of Henry VIII.

signed in May 1534 by the Earl of Ossory.[1] The King, in this instrument confers on the Irish grandee the government of the counties of Kilkenny, Waterford, and Tipperary, and of the territories of Ossory and Ormond; and the Earl engages in return "to resist the usurpation of the Bishop of Rome."[2] In this memorial Ossory attributes the evils of Ireland to the way in which the Pope had abused his authority in making ecclesiastical appointments. It is not at all probable that the author of this statement had earnestly studied the great questions which now provoked so much discussion; and his engagement to resist the Pope simply illustrates the facility with which some of the most influential of the nobles were prepared to yield to royal dictation; but he could testify from his own observation as to the scandalous manner in which the pontifical patronage was prostituted.[3]

It has been taken for granted, by writers not a few, that the dilapidation of the Irish Church in the sixteenth century originated in the confusion created by the Reformation. The public documents of the period establish quite a different conclusion. These witnesses attest that the Church fabrics almost everywhere presented a very ruinous appearance long before any attempt was made to change the ecclesiastical constitution. As early as 1440 the decayed state of the sacred edifices in Ulster attracted general notice. About that period the Archbishop of Armagh sought—apparently with but little success—to have them repaired. According to a writer who records this effort, the "winds and drifting snow came in through the roof; and the windows, which once had stained many-coloured glass of the purest kind, were now unglazed and unframed."[4] The disorders which disturbed the whole land for at least a century before the Reformation, had reduced Ireland to a wretched condition. The chiefs in their wars with each other destroyed many churches and

[1] The title of Earl of Ormond was transferred some time before to Sir Thomas Boleyn, father of Anne Boleyn; but, on his death in 1537, it reverted to the Butlers.—Moore, iii. 238, *note*; 284, *note*.

[2] Haverty, p. 360; Moore, iii. 295.

[3] See, for example, Malone, p. 352, *note*.

[4] *Ibid.* 376, *note*.

monasteries;[1] and the English Pale—impoverished by intolerable exactions, exposed to the frequent incursions of the Irish enemy, and left unprotected by a feeble government—was, perhaps, the most miserable portion of the country.[2] The native churchmen and the Anglo-Irish clergy were at deadly enmity; and the religious houses—practically without any supervision—sunk into decay.[3] Monks in the Irish districts refused to acknowledge Anglo-Irishmen appointed as their superiors. If these strange abbots attempted to enter upon duty, "the Irish threw themselves into the churches, mounted to the belfry, let fly arrows, and repelled all approach."[4] A memorial drawn up in 1543 describes "the cathedral churches, monasteries, parish churches, and all other, regular and secular, for the more part, in effect through the land, *in utter ruin and destroyed*."[5] In 1525 the Earl of Kildare declares in a public document, that "all the churches for the most part within the counties of Kilkenny and Tipperary are *in such extreme decay* by reason *that no divine service is kept there*."[6] In 1516, in a report made to the Pope, it is stated that the Cathedral of Clonmacnois is "in a half-ruined state, unroofed, with only

---

[1] See, for example, *Annals of the Four Masters*, at A.D. 1508 and 1530.

[2] Richey's *Lectures*, second series, pp. 20, 36.

[3] In returns made to the Royal Commissioners in 1537 we find the following revelations:—"Item, in the same quarter of Tipperary—James Butler, Abbot of Inislonaght and Dean of Lismore, . . . is a man of odious life, taking yearly and daily men's wifes and daughters, and keepeth no divine service. . . . So the house is all decayed. . . . Item, the Abbey of Innyslawenaghte beside Clonmel . . . useth no divine service . . . . and the Abbot of the same using his leman or harlot openly by day and night to his pleasure, and every monk of his having his harlot. . . . Item, we find the Prior our Lady's Abbey of the Friars Karmys (Carmelites) useth to have his leman and harlot openly, and no divine service. . . . Item, . . . the Abbey [of Athashell] . . . . having no divine service, but few masses, with four canons, and some of them using and having wives and children."—*The Social State of the Southern and Eastern Counties of Ireland in the Sixteenth Century*, by H. F. Hore, Esq. and the Rev. James Graves, A.B., M.R.I.A. Dublin, 1870, pp. 202, 248. Printed by the Kilkenny and South-east of Ireland Archæological Society.

[4] Malone, p. 376.

[5] *Carew MSS.* 1515-74, p. 55. London, 1867.

[6] *Carew MSS.* 1515-74, p. 33. In this document the Earl farther states:—"The late Bishop of Leighlin was heinously murdered by the Abbot of Duske's son, . . . that the Abbot might enjoy that bishopric."—*Ibid.* The murderer was, it appears, his own archdeacon. See Cotton's *Fasti*, ii. 387.

one altar, covered with straw. . . . Here mass is seldom celebrated."[1] In 1517, in another report made to the Pope, we are informed that "a large proportion of the inhabitants (in the diocese of Armagh) live with the cattle in the fields and in caves; almost all of them wear no shoes, and are given up to robbery. . . . In the cathedral church there is only one altar—indeed it is wholly exposed to the air, and in it, by one priest only, and that but seldom, mass is celebrated."[2] In 1528 Inge, Archbishop of Dublin, states that "the diocese of Meath, which is large in cure, and most of value in this country, for an honourable man to continue in, is *far in ruin*, both spiritually and temporally, by the absence of the Bishop there."[3] These dilapidations continued and increased until the close of the sixteenth century, but the facts now enumerated abundantly prove that the ruinous condition of the churches and monasteries cannot fairly be attributed to the change in religion.

The Italian Pontiff was the great patron of the conventual institutions; and yet in the former part of the reign of Henry VIII., a number of monasteries were suppressed in England with the papal sanction. In 1528, when the King was still in communion with Rome, forty of the smaller religious houses in Ireland shared the same fate.[4] Their irregularities were assigned as the cause of their extinction; and their fall seems to have excited no special notice. At this time upwards of five hundred of these establishments are said to have existed in the country.[5] No less than four and twenty abbots and priors sat among the Irish peers;[6] and no one could have

---

[1] Theiner's *Vetera Monumenta*, p. 518. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 521.

[3] Cogan's *Diocese of Meath*, i. 84. Dublin, 1862.

[4] King, ii. 713.

[5] According to some, the number was 537; according to others, 565; and others do not consider them so numerous. See Malone, p. 413; and Richey, Second series, p. 64.

[6] See Ware's *Annals of Ireland*, Henry VIII., chap. xxxi., where the names are given. Ware there says that the Abbots of Mellifont, of St. Thomas, near Dublin, and of the Blessed Virgin Mary near Dublin, and the Prior of Kilmainham, were constantly summoned; the rest, especially those who were far distant, were seldom called upon.

anticipated that in a few years all these great personages would disappear from the upper house of legislation.

George Browne, who was promoted to the See of Dublin by Henry VIII. in 1535, was the first preacher of the reformed doctrine in Ireland. He was indebted for his advancement to the celebrated Thomas Cromwell, who, after the fall of Cardinal Wolsey, guided, for a time, the movements of the English sovereign. Browne had been educated at Holywell in Oxford in an Augustinian friary,[1] and had subsequently been provincial of his order in England. He possessed a fair share of the learning of the age; and his sermons had already attracted considerable notice, as he ignored the invocation of Saints, and exhorted his auditors to address their prayers to Christ alone. About the time that Browne came to Ireland he was associated with a body of commissioners, charged with the revision of its ecclesiastical arrangements. The doctrine of the royal supremacy had been already received in England; and the new Archbishop was expected to exert himself to secure its recognition in his adopted country. But difficulties soon presented themselves which the King does not seem to have anticipated. Party jealousies had probably some influence in stirring up hostility; for Cromer, the Primate of all Ireland, had recently been removed from the office of Lord Chancellor;[2] and he was disposed to look with no very favourable eye on any proposal which originated with His Grace of Dublin. In September, 1535, Archbishop Browne states, in a letter to his patron Cromwell, "that he had endeavoured, almost to the hazard of his life, to reduce the nobility and gentry of Ireland to due obedience in owning the King their supreme head, as well spiritual as temporal; but that he was much opposed therein, especially by Cromer, Archbishop of Armagh, who had laid a curse on the people whoever should own the King's supremacy, and had thereby drawn to him the most of his suffragans and clergy within his jurisdiction; that the Archbishop and priests of Armagh had sent two messengers to Rome, and that it was feared O'Neill [the great chief of Ulster] would be ordered by the Pope to

[1] King, ii. 681.

[2] Ware, i. 91; Leland, ii. 160-1.

oppose the changes; that the island had been for a long time held in ignorance by the Romish regulars [referring, no doubt, chiefly to the Mendicant Friars]; and that the seculars were as ignorant as the people, being not able to say mass, or pronounce the words—not knowing what they themselves say in the Roman tongue."[1] Cromer might meanwhile consider himself justified in the course he was pursuing, as the law yet remained unchanged; and Browne accordingly suggested that a Parliament should be called to give its authoritative sanction to the alterations contemplated.

The Parliament, which met in May, 1537, declared the King supreme Head, on earth, of the Church of Ireland; and interdicted all appeals to Rome.[2] It provided for the payment into the royal treasury of all first fruits,[3] as well of bishoprics, deaneries, and minor ecclesiastical benefices, as of abbeys, priories, and other monastic foundations. The authority of the Bishop of Rome was solemnly renounced; and all maintainers of it made subject to premunire. All officials of every class were required to take the oath of supremacy;[4] and all who refused were declared guilty of high treason. Forty of the smaller monasteries, as we have seen, had already been suppressed;[5] and, by an Act now passed, twelve more were consigned to extinction.[6] Several of the old penal laws were revived in all their absurdity. Marriage and fostering with the Irish were forbidden; and, throughout the Pale, the use of the English language and habit was strictly enjoined. No

[1] Ware, i. 349; Macgeoghegan, p. 412.

[2] The Irish Acts on this subject are the 28th of Henry VIII., chaps. v. and vi.

[3] The 28th of Henry VIII., chaps. viii. and xxvi.

[4] The 28th of Henry VIII., chap. xiii.

[5] That is in 1528. See King, ii. 713.

[6] By 28th of Henry VIII., chap. xvi. Some Roman Catholic writers bitterly deplore the suppression of these monasteries, on the ground that they were almshouses, and that the poor suffered greatly by their extinction. Contemporaries give a very different account of them. It was said that the Irish convents were even in a worse state than those in England—"the religious persons less continent and virtuous—*keeping no hospitality* saving to themselves, their concubines, and children."—Froude, iv. 75. Cowley to Cromwell. *State Papers*, vol. ii., p. 371. See the account given of them by an Irish Cistercian abbot, who flourished in the preceding century, in chap. v., p. 319, *note* (4). See also p. 336, *note* (3) of this chapter.

ecclesiastical preferment was to be conferred on any one who did not speak the English tongue, except in cases in which, after repeated proclamations in the next market-town, no such person could be found. A law was made for the establishment of an English school in every district; but the legislators seem to have expected that the parochial clergyman was himself to act as teacher.[1]

The bill for the establishment of the royal supremacy met with much opposition. An attempt was made to secure its rejection by insisting on the right of proctors—who represented the clergy—to vote as members of the legislature. Two of these from each diocese had been usually summoned to meet the great council of the nation "to declare their opinions upon such things of learning as should happen in controversy;"[2] and, as they had little to lose by incurring the displeasure of government, it was understood that, on the present occasion, they were prepared to resist the will of the court with the weight of their united suffrages. It appeared, however, on an examination of the records, that various acts of Parliament had been passed to which these proctors had refused their sanction;[3] the law officers of the crown pronounced their claim to be untenable; and the legislature, by an express resolution, affirmed it to be groundless and presumptuous. It was enacted that they should be recognized, not as members of Parliament, but simply as "counsellors and assistants."[4] The clerical influence was thus greatly weakened; and, though the Supremacy Bill still encountered much resistance, Archbishop Browne at length succeeded in securing for it a place in the statute-book.

But though this prelate now acted so prominent a part in connection with the change of religion in Ireland, it is to be

---

[1] All these arrangements are prescribed in the 28th of Henry VIII., chap. xv. According to this Act the Bishop or Archbishop, at such time as he admits any one to the order of priest, deacon, or sub-deacon, is to exact from him "a corporal oath" that he shall "learn the English tongue," and endeavour to "teach all other being under his order, rule and governance, to accomplish and perform the same." § ix.

[2] *Irish Statutes*, 28th of Henry VIII., chap. xii.

[3] King, ii. 690.

[4] *Irish Statutes*, 28th of Henry VIII., chap. xii.

feared that he possessed, after all, but little of the spirit of a true evangelist. The spoils of the dissolved abbeys[1] were soon distributed among the courtiers of Henry; and yet we do not find Browne making any protest against such misappropriation. Instead of insisting that at least a portion of them should be employed in promoting the general enlightenment of the people, he solicits once and again for a share to himself[2]—though he already enjoyed a very ample income. Neither does his zeal against idolatry appear to have been regulated by discretion. In Scotland, Holland, and other countries, the Reformers did not commence by the demolition of the symbols of superstition. Had they done so, they would immediately have alienated the whole community. They adopted a more excellent way; they taught the people; they showed them the folly of idolatry; they convinced them that the worship of images is condemned in Scripture; that it dishonours God; and that it provokes His indignation. And so thoroughly did they obtain possession of the public mind, that the mob often rushed to the churches in a state of excitement, and dashed to pieces the very objects which they had been long accustomed to reverence. But Browne destroyed the images and relics before the multitude were convinced of the sin and folly of doing them honour. We are told, indeed, that he preached, not only in Dublin, but also in Carlow Wexford, Waterford, and Tipperary;[3] and in his discourses

---

[1] "In the reign of Henry VIII. the number of vicarages had so largely increased that, at that period, *one half of the entire tithes of Ireland* had passed into the hands of the monasteries. By two Irish Acts of Parliaments (28th Henry VIII., chap. xvi.; and 33rd Henry VIII., chap. v. all the revenues pertaining to these monasteries, and the landed property belonging to them, were transferred to the crown."—*Essays on the Irish Church*, p. 226. Dublin, 1866.

[2] See Moore, iii. 304. At a subsequent period we find Bale complaining of him. See Mant, i. 225-6. Bale does not hesitate to style him "*that great epicure the archbishop.*" See Richey's *Lectures*, Second series, p. 212. Basnet, or Bassenet, who was made Dean of St. Patrick's in 1537, complains that Browne refused to confirm his election unless he received a fee of £200. The new Dean resisted this demand.—*Calendar of the Carew MSS.*, 1575, 1588. Introd., 76, *note.* London, 1868.

[3] King, ii. 699. If we may judge from a specimen given in Ware (pp. 159-162, *Annals of Ireland.* Reign of Queen Mary. Ed. Dublin, 1705) his sermons could not have occupied more than from eight to ten minutes each in the delivery. It

he bitterly denounced the worship of idols; but, as he did not express himself in a language which the masses understood, his English sermons could not be expected to make much impression on an Irish-speaking population.[1] By destroying statues and crucifixes, before the people could appreciate the motives which dictated their demolition, he only offended their prejudices without securing any counterbalancing advantage.[2] The crozier, known as *the Staff of Jesus*, had long been held sacred; it was said to have been formerly in the possession of the Apostle of Ireland, and to have been handed down from our Lord himself; it was supposed to have the power of working miracles; and, for at least seven hundred years, it had been regarded as one of the most precious of Ireland's relics;[3] but, in the presence of an assembled multitude, Browne caused it to be thrown into the fire, to prove that it could be consumed like any other piece of timber. An image of the Virgin at Trim was believed to be endowed with marvellous virtues: pilgrimages were made to it; and the priests, by a jugglery with which some of them were familiar, gained for it extraordinary credit.[4] This also was consigned to the flames by order of the Archbishop. Nor did Browne otherwise greatly commend himself to the hearts of Irishmen. He is said, indeed, to have been liberal in his benefactions to the poor; but his manner was dictatorial and overbearing; and, though he possessed undoubted ability, he does not seem to have been a favourite even with his own colleagues.

---

appears that he preached very seldom, and that he had but a small supply of sermons. See Richey's *Lectures*, Second series, p. 233; and Shirley's *Original Letters on the Church of Ireland*, p. 19. London, 1851.

[1] At this time Irish was spoken by the majority of the population even in Dublin. See Leland, ii. 119.

[2] It is right to state that complaints made by some Roman Catholic writers relative to the destruction of churches by the Reforming party, about this period, are without foundation. Thus, the destruction of the Cathedral of Down and other acts of violence of the same description mentioned in Brenan (*Ecc. Hist. of Ireland*, p. 395), seem to have had nothing to do with the question of religion. They were performed by Lord Leonard Grey, who was devoutly attached to the old superstition. See Haverty, p. 365; and King, ii. 698.

[3] See before, pp. 118, 119. See also Ulster *Journal of Archæology*, vol. ix. 51-56.

[4] See *Annals of Ireland* from 1443 to 1468, at A.D. 1444, p. 205, 267.

When the Dublin Archbishop was carrying on war against images and relics, the abettors of Romanism were not idle. A report of the doings in Ireland soon reached the capital of Italy; and the Pope lost no time in taking steps to arrest the progress of ecclesiastical defection. A communication was received from him by Cromer of Armagh and his clergy, enjoining them to persevere boldly in support of the Papal authority, and empowering them to absolve those who had been induced to acknowledge the royal supremacy. Such delinquents were commanded, under penalty of the highest ecclesiastical censures, to make confession of their guilt within forty days, and to enter into a new engagement of fidelity to the Western Pontiff. According to the form of the vow of obedience circulated at this time in various parts of the country, every one was required by oath to pledge himself to "count all acts made, or to be made, by heretical powers, of no force;" and to "declare him or her, father or mother, brother or sister, son or daughter, husband or wife, uncle or aunt, nephew or niece, kinsman or kinswoman, master or mistress, and all others nearest or dearest relations, accursed," who recognised any ecclesiastical or *civil* jurisdiction above the authority of the Mother Church of Rome.[1]

At this period the Pope used all the influence he could possibly exert to induce the Irish to renounce their allegiance to the English sovereign. Paul III. now published his famous bull of excommunication,[2] declaring Henry dethroned, pronouncing him infamous, dissolving all leagues between him and other Catholic princes, commanding his nobles to take up arms against him, and consigning him to "*eternal damnation.*"[3] The impatience with which many of the Irish

---

[1] See Ware's *Works, Annals of Ireland, Life and Death of George Browne*, p. 151-2; King, ii. 694; Leland, ii. 171.

[2] The Bull was originally framed in August 1535; but it was not published until the close of 1538. Among the few towns in which it was to be formally announced, the Pope mentions "Tuam or Ardfert in Ireland." Paul was aware that in these places such a bold proceeding might safely be attempted. See King, ii. 708-9.

[3] "Damnationis aeternae mucrone percutimus." A second Bull was framed authorizing the publication of the sentence. Both may be found in Burnet's *Hist. of the Reformation*, vol. iv., pp. 94-100, ed. London, 1841. The author of these

chieftains submitted to the English government was well known; and an attempt was made to give a religious complexion to their political prejudices. A Franciscan friar, named Thady Birne, who had just arrived from the continent, and who was apprehended in Dublin about the midsummer of 1538, was discovered to be the bearer of treasonable correspondence. One of the documents found in his possession was addressed to O'Neill of Ulster, and was written, it would appear, by an episcopal dignitary[1] at the instigation of the Council of Cardinals. The following is a copy of this singular production:—

"My son O'Neill,—You, as well as your ancestors, have ever been faithful to the Mother Church of Rome. His Holiness Paul, our present Pope, and his Council of holy Fathers, have lately discovered a prophecy of St. Laserianus, an Irish Bishop of Cashel,[2] in which it is foretold that the Church of Rome shall surely fall when the Catholic faith is once overthrown in Ireland. Put down, therefore, all heresy and the enemies of his Holiness, for the glory of the Mother Church, the honour of St. Peter, and your own safety; for when the Catholic faith will perish in Ireland the Church of

---

Bulls (Paul III.) was in early life a man of very licentious character. See Reid's *Mosheim*, p. 612, *note* 5.

[1] Warner, in his *History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars of Ireland* (vol. i., p. 13) gives this letter, which he says he "copied from the MSS. belonging to the Dublin Society—taken from the Black Book of Christ's Church." It may be found in Ware, *Life and Death of George Brown*, pp. 152-3; Leland, ii. 172; and elsewhere. In the supplement to Burke's *Hibernia Dominicana*, p. 873, may be found a letter from Paul III. to Con O'Neill, dated April 1541, written in the most adulatory style, and stirring him up to rebellion. Moran states (*Archbishops of Dublin*, p. 33) that "within the three years from 1538 to 1541 at least sixteen bishops were appointed by the Holy See to the vacant dioceses of Ireland." It is pretty certain that one of these was appointed to Meath to supersede Edward Staples, who had signalized himself by his Protestant tendencies. This new Bishop of Meath—probably Birne himself—seems to have been the writer of this letter. Hence his terror, when apprehended, was so extreme that he committed suicide. He knew well that he might expect no mercy were it discovered that, in defiance of the royal authority, he had dared to accept the Bishopric of Meath.

[2] Laserian was Abbot of Old Leighlin, and not Bishop of Cashel; but nothing is more common among Irish writers than mistakes of this kind. See before, p. 65, *note* (1).

Rome shall also fall. The Council of Cardinals have, therefore, deemed it necessary to animate the people of the holy island in this pious cause, being assured that, while the Mother Church has sons of such worth as you, and those who will unite with you, she shall not fall, but prevail for ever, in some degree at least in Britain. Having thus obeyed the orders of the Sacred Council, we recommend your royal person to the Holy Trinity, to the Blessed Virgin, to St. Peter and St. Paul, and the whole court of heaven. Amen.

"EPISCOPUS METENSIS."[1]

There is no reason whatever to doubt that this document was found among the papers of an agent specially employed by the Romish party to stir up the Irish chiefs against the colonial government. Its genuineness has been challenged;[2] but it is evidently absurd to adopt the conclusion which some Roman Catholic writers have suggested, and to assert that it was "invented by the heretics."[3] If "invented" at all, it must have had a very different origin. It is most likely that it was drawn up by Birne himself, or by some one appointed by the Pope to supplant Edward Staples in the Bishopric of Meath. It has been asserted that Laserian is a saint of whose existence we have no trace elsewhere; but even this allegation cannot be sustained.[4] A slight error as to the

---

[1] Warner translates this signature "Bishop of Meath"—instead of "Bishop of Metz," the common interpretation. The Bishop of Meath is more usually styled *Midensis*, but his title is variously written. The author of the letter may have used the word Metensis for the sake of concealment, should the letter fall into a hostile hand.

[2] See Moore's *Hist. of Ireland*, iii. 303.

[3] Macgeoghegan, p. 419.

[4] "Lasreanus or Lazerianus," says Ussher, "is the man who in other legends, —— is reported to have been the Bishop of Rome's legate in Ireland, and is commonly accounted to have been the first Bishop of the Church of Leighlin."—*Religion of the Ancient Irish*, chap. ix. He is mentioned in the *Life of Munna*. See also Archdall's *Monasticon*, by Moran, pp. 59, 60, *note*. At the Synod of Maghlene (see p. 63 and 65, *note* (1), he is said to have supported the Romish method of keeping Easter. *Ibid.* Laserian may have asserted on this occasion that all who refused to conform to the Romish method of observance endangered the Church of Ireland, and from some such statement the tradition mentione in the text may have originated.

place with which Laserian was connected does not prove that the epistle was not suggested by the cardinals; for many apocryphal statements have emanated from the same quarter; and even the bull of Adrian, conveying Ireland to the English sovereign, contains a number of monstrous fabrications. The epistle was well fitted to flatter the vanity of O'Neill, and to win him over to the side of the sovereign Pontiff. But it certainly transgressed the bounds of truth when it stated that he and his ancestors had been "ever faithful to the Mother Church of Rome." One of these ancestors, about two hundred years before, had denounced the bull of Adrian as fraught with woes to Irishmen, and had complained bitterly of "the miserable condition to which the Pope of Rome" had reduced his country.[1] The chieftain who made these bold charges had joined the standard of Edward Bruce; and had been, in consequence, excommunicated. More recently, an O'Neill had refused to recognize the jurisdiction of the Primate of Armagh appointed by the Pope, and had persevered in his opposition until assured of the payment of a tribute of good broadcloth.[2] The present possessor of the title was not disposed to hazard much for the maintenance of Romanism; but "the Church" might prove a very fitting war-cry, by which he could rally around him the enemies of the English government. The clergy had recently received commands from the Pope to beat "the drum ecclesiastic;" many of the abbeys had been suppressed; and, should the great northern dynast engage in a religious war, he might reckon on the sympathy and support of all the monastic orders. But to represent O'Neill as a veritable champion of the faith is superlatively ridiculous. He was so uneducated that he could not write his own name;[3] he cared little for religion of any kind; he lived very much like a savage; and set at defiance all the laws of morality and decency.[4] He had not the slightest idea of being a martyr either for the supremacy of Rome or the supremacy of Eng-

---

[1] See before, p. 276.

[2] See before, p. 324.

[3] See Haverty, p. 369.

[4] See Froude's *History of England*, vol. viii., pp. 11-12. London, 1870.

land; but he was most anxious to assert his own ascendency in Ulster; and, could he have secured that object, he would have felt no compunction whatever in yielding a nominal allegiance either to Popery or Protestantism.

Had Irishmen now been capable of taking an enlightened view of their position, they must have seen that they were under no obligations to sustain the threatened supremacy of the Bishop of Rome. He had robbed their country of almost everything that a nation should hold dear. Until the twelfth century they had not acknowledged even his ecclesiastical jurisdiction; and yet, long before that century had completed its revolution, he had claimed to be lord of their green island, and had handed them over to the authority of a foreign potentate. Whilst they had lost their independence, they had also lost their literature; and they were now as noted for their ignorance as they had once been for their scholarship. Archbishop Browne states, in a letter written about this period to Cromwell, that most of the clergy were "not able to speak right words in the mass or liturgy, as being not skilled in the Latin grammar, so that a bird might be taught to speak with as much sense" as some of them.[1] Since the English came among them their religion had been sadly corrupted; and will-worship in all its forms now disfigured their ritual. Their property had been confiscated; their very language had been proscribed; and for ages the highest dignities in their Church had been held, not by natives, but by Anglicans or Italians. If they had reason to abhor England, they had still greater reason to abhor the Pope; for he had, as soon as they owned his jurisdiction, sold them into slavery, and had continued ever afterwards to patronize their oppressors. If a second Patrick or Columbkille had now risen up among them to preach to them in the tongue they loved, the Reformed faith might have made as rapid progress in Ireland as in some other countries of Europe. But no such evangelist appeared. For ages almost the only preachers in the island were the Mendicant Friars: the pre-

[1] This letter, dated April 1538, may be found in Ware, *Life and Death of George Browne, Annals of Ireland*, p. 150. Ed. Dublin, 1705.

rogatives of the heir of St. Patrick generally formed the beginning and the end of their discourses; and now, when the people were required by Act of Parliament to renounce the yoke of Rome, it was not remarkable that they hesitated to submit to such unscrupulous dictation.

O'Neill had long been struggling against English ascendency; and appeals from the Pope, in letters such as that already quoted, were not addressed to him in vain. He coveted a plausible apology for throwing off the hated yoke of Britain; and he knew that, were he to proclaim war on the ground of preventing a revolution in the Church, he would add greatly to the numbers and enthusiasm of his followers. In obedience to the papal summons, he now determined on hostilities; and assumed the dangerous post of leader of the northern Irish. The native clergy eagerly espoused his cause, stirred up the inferior chieftains, and soon placed him at the head of a powerful confederacy.[1] But the Viceroy, Lord Leonard Grey, was equal to the emergency. He quickly collected a body of troops sufficient to meet the insurgents; and, in the summer of 1539, gave them a signal overthrow at a place called Bellahoe, on the borders of Meath.[2] On the removal, immediately afterwards, of this energetic nobleman from the government of Ireland, the native leaders recovered from their consternation, and were joined by Murrough O'Brien—who had just now become Prince of Thomond.[3] But Sir William Brereton, the successor of Lord Leonard Grey in the Viceroyalty, exhibited such vigour and determination that the confederates were intimidated and dispersed.[4] During the remainder of the reign of Henry VIII., no attempt worthy of notice was made to overturn the government.

---

[1] Leland, ii. 173. It appears that Leverous, afterwards Bishop of Kildare, was mainly instrumental in organizing this confederacy.—Moran's *Archbishops of Dublin*, p. 57.

[2] Leland, ii. 174-5; Moore, iii. 286. This battle was fought at a ford near the old bridge of Bellahoe. This was the principal pass into the famous territory of Farney. It is about four and a quarter miles south of Carrickmacross on the boundary of Meath and Monaghan, close to the lake of the same name. See *Account of the Territory or Dominion of Farney*, by Evelyn P. Shirley, Esq., p. 37, *note*. London, 1845. [3] Leland, ii. 176. [4] *Ibid.*, ii. 177.

The Irish, led on at this time by O'Neill and O'Brien, were not the men to make martyrs. They were greedy of plunder, and they detested the English race; but, when overmatched by the arm of British power, they were not disposed to perplex themselves about questions of theology. In the end, all the chieftains of any consideration acknowledged the royal supremacy, and submitted quietly to the ecclesiastical revolution.[1] Even O'Neill—on whom, as the champion of their cause, the Pope and the clergy had lavished so much flattery—entered into a stringent engagement to support the policy of Henry. "I entirely renounce obedience to the Roman Pontiff and his usurped authority," declared the Pope's dear son, "and I recognise the King to be the supreme Head of the Church of England and Ireland under Christ, and I will compel all living under my rule to do the same."[2] The Earl of Desmond, O'Donnel, McMahon, O'More, O'Rorke, and others of inferior consequence, had already pledged themselves to this course.[3] Many of the dignified clergy complied much earlier. In a report to Cromwell, dated February 8th, 1539, from certain members of the Privy Council of Ireland who were making a visitation of the southern counties, it is stated that at Clonmel the Archbishops of Cashel and Tuam, with eight Bishops, joined the deputation; and "took the oath mentioned in the Act of Parliament" touching the King's supremacy, "in the presence of the Lord Chancellor."[4] Cromer of Armagh appears to have already given way to the pressure brought to bear upon him;[5] but he complied with reluctance; and he could not, of

[1] Leland, ii. 177, 180; Haverty, p. 372; *Columbanus ad Hibernos*, No. 2, p. xxxviii.

[2] *Carew MSS.*, vol. i., p. 188. O'Neill came to Maynooth in January 1543 to make this submission. O'Conor's *Historical Address*, part ii., p. 279. Two or three years before he had written submissive letters.—Haverty, p. 371.

[3] *Carew MSS.*, vol. i., pp. 174, 183, 185, 195. The Earl of Desmond submitted in 1540, O'Donnel and McMahon in 1542, O'More in May 1543.—O'Conor, *Hist. Address*, pp. 278-9. A specimen of these submissions may be found in King, supplementary volume, pp. 1206-8.

[4] King, ii. 701-2.

[5] See Stuart's *Armagh*, p. 234. Renehan, in his *Collections on Irish Church History*, p. 2, all but admits that Cromer, in his "despair," submitted to Henry.

course, be expected to be very zealous in urging submission on his suffragans.[1] Before the close of Henry's reign, the oath of supremacy seems to have been taken generally by the clergy in all places where the British power predominated.[2]

When the question of the supremacy was first mooted in Ireland, the advocates of the Papacy contended that the claim of the Crown was inadmissible, inasmuch as the English monarch had been originally constituted "lord" of the country by the sovereign Pontiff. "You destroy," said they, "the title of the King to dominion if you disown the title of the Pope." It was impossible to furnish a logical answer to such reasoning; and yet it was pressed so vigorously that it could not be altogether ignored. Government at length proposed an arrangement by which they hoped to render it of little significance. In June of the year 1542 a Parliament, constructed on something like a national basis, was convened in Dublin. Old Irish chiefs,[3] as well as Anglo-Irish and English Deputies, sat in this assembly. The business was carried on in English; but, for the benefit of such as were unacquainted with that language, the principal addresses—those of the Speaker and the Lord Chancellor—were repeated in Irish by the Earl of Ormond.[4] By an Act of this Parliament[5] Henry was declared to be "King of Ireland:"

Dr. Moran has removed all doubt on this subject, and he has shown that in July 1539 Cromer was suspended by the Pope; and in the following year Waucop was appointed Archbishop of Armagh by the same authority. See Moran's *Archbishops of Dublin*, pp. 31-2.

[1] See King, ii. 696. In a letter to Cromwell, already quoted, and dated April 1538, Browne complains that the Primate of Armagh "is not *active* to execute his Highness's orders." Among the earliest conformists were Eugene Magennis, Bishop of Down and Connor, Roland Burke, Bishop of Clonfert, Florence Gerawan, Bishop of Clonmacnois, Matthew Saunders, Bishop of Leighlin, and Hugh O'Cervallan, Bishop of Clogher.—Brenan, p. 394.

[2] In the reign of Henry the boundaries of the Pale were very much enlarged. The Four Masters declare that, in the end of this reign, "the power of the English was great and immense in Ireland." See O'Donovan's *Four Masters*, A.D. 1546, vol. v., p. 1499.

[3] O'Brien of Thomond appeared by his procurators; Kavenagh, O'More, O'Reilly, MacWilliam and others, took their seats in person.—Haverty, p. 370. Moore, iii. 316.

[4] Moore, iii. 316-7.

[5] The 33rd of Henry VIII., chap. i.

and a title thus conferred on him, by a full meeting of the national representatives, was believed to place his claim to the sovereignty of the island above challenge. This measure was amazingly popular. The passing of the Act was celebrated with wonderful rejoicings. The gaols were opened, and prisoners set at liberty ; bonfires blazed ; wine was dispensed freely in the streets ; and "there were great feastings in the houses."[1]

Whilst many of the old Hibernian chiefs and of the people joined heartily in these jubilations, there were others to whom they must have been superlatively distasteful. In 1540 the Society of the Jesuits obtained the approval of Paul III. ; and in the following year two of its leaders—John Codure and Alphonsus Salmeron—were appointed to visit Ireland.[2] The order was introduced into this country by Robert Waucop—nominated by the Pope to the Archbishopric of Armagh—as soon as it was ascertained that Cromer had taken the oath of supremacy.[3] Waucop, who was a Scotchman by birth, had long been noted for his extraordinary endowments. Though nearly blind from childhood, he had acquired a considerable share of the learning of the age: he was a most artful diplomatist ; and, so great confidence was placed in his ability, that the Pope employed him to act as his representative at the Courts of France and Germany.[4] From this date we may distinctly trace the influence of the Jesuits in the plots and wars which for so long afterwards disturbed Ireland. Sup-

[1] Leland, ii. 178-9 ; Haverty, p. 370.

[2] In the letter of Paul III. to Con O'Neill, dated April 1541, Codure and Salmeron are named as his Irish agents. See Supplement to *Hibernia Dominicana*, p. 873. Codure died soon after his appointment. Salmeron and another Jesuit, named Pasquier Brouet, accompanied by a Notary Apostolic, named Francis Zapata, soon afterwards set out for Ireland. See the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* for April 1870, pp. 306-313.

[3] Cromer, as stated in a preceding note, was suspended by the Pope in 1539 "from all exercise of primatial jurisdiction till such time as he should purge himself of the suspicion of heresy ;" and before the close of 1540 Waucop was made Archbishop. Moran's *Archbishops of Dublin*, pp. 31-2. Cromer died in 1543.

[4] Renehan's *Collections*, pp. 3-4. Some have asserted that Waucop was quite blind from infancy—but this is a mistake. See Moran, p. 31, *note*. Notwithstanding his physical defect, he is said to have been a first-rate horseman.

ported by the money of foreign princes, delighting in intrigue, unscrupulous as to the means employed, and reckless of consequences, they were found wherever they hoped to be able to carry out a scheme for the overthrow of the English Government.

For a time their machinations produced little fruit. The Irish chiefs were so intimidated and humbled by the defeats they had recently experienced, that they were not now disposed to listen to the counsels of those who encouraged them to rebellion. Of late Henry had been rapidly rising in the estimation of the native nobility and gentry; and as they expected, no doubt, to obtain a goodly portion of the spoil,[1] they offered no opposition to the additional arrangements now made for the suppression of the monasteries. The wealth of the religious houses was a tempting bait; as, according to calculations which have been instituted, in this reign one half of the entire tithes of Ireland were in the possession of these establishments.[2] In 1542 an Act of the legislature placed their property in the hands of the King.[3] The heads of the principal houses received handsome pensions. The Prior of Kilmainham was secured an income of £500 per annum[4]—a sum equal to the salary long paid to the Irish Viceroy. Provision was also made in some cases for the support of the ordinary members of the extinguished fraternities.[5]

Though in the reign of Henry VIII. the doctrine of the royal supremacy was at length so generally accepted in Ireland, very little progress was made in the way of religious reformation. Archbishop Browne published for the use of his clergy a Form of Prayer in English containing petitions for the Catholic Church, the King, and some others, which were to be taught to the people.[6] Translations into English of the Lord's Prayer, the Hail Mary, the Creed, and the Ten Commandments, were also put into circulation.[7] But the Mass

---

1 See Haverty, p. 372.

2 See *Essays on the Irish Church*, pp. 226-8. Oxford and London, 1866.

3 33rd of Henry VIII., sess. 2, chap. v.

4 Richey's *Lectures*, Second series, p. 148.

5 *Ibid.*, Second series, pp. 147-8.

6 King, ii. 698.

7 *Ibid.*, ii. 700.

was still used in the Latin tongue; and with the exception of the recognition of the Papal Supremacy all the other leading peculiarities of Romanism were retained.[1] Even the translations into English of the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the Commandments, were of no service to a people who could not read, and more than nine-tenths of whom understood nothing but Irish.

It has often been observed that no blood was shed in Ireland on account of religion during the whole of the reign of Henry VIII.[2] This fact, however, does not prove that a tolerant spirit now predominated. It rather indicates that there was at this time in the country very little enlightened and earnest Protestantism. We have no evidence that, at the death of this monarch, there was even one intelligent professor of the Reformed faith in all Ulster, Connaught, or Munster. The multitude were sunk in superstition; and those who moved in a higher sphere did not rightly appreciate the doctrines which were creating such excitement elsewhere. Had there been many to protest against the royal supremacy, or to deny transubstantiation, the Irish annals of this period would certainly not have been blank in the department of martyrology. The Act for the establishment of the King's title, as Head on earth of the Church, produced no change otherwise in the accustomed worship; and it is a singular fact that it led, not to the decrease, but to the extension of English influence. The very year before Henry's death the Irish chiefs addressed to him a letter in which they bear a remarkable testimony to the state of the island. "We acknowledge," say they, "that there lives not in Ireland any, were he of the age of Nestor, who has seen the country in a more peaceful condition; and although we who have hitherto by distinction been usually called Irish, do not as yet answer to right and

---

[1] "Henry," says Brenan, "was a *schismatic;* but there is no proof that he was ever a *heretic*."—*Ecc. Hist.*, p. 396.

[2] Haverty, p. 367. The exceptions cited by this writer apparently are not so, properly. Travers seems to have suffered for his complicity in the rebellion of Lord Thomas Fitzgerald. About the time of the suppression of the monasteries some of the monks exposed themselves to the charge of sedition.

law as exactly as the others, who from their cradles and earliest infancy have been well educated in the same; nevertheless, with our utmost efforts we strive to attain unto them, and we call God to witness that we acknowledge no other King or Lord on earth except your Majesty."[1]

---

[1] *State Papers*, Ireland, vol. ii., part iii., p. 562.

CHAPTER II.

THE REIGNS OF EDWARD VI. AND MARY.[1] A.D. 1547 TO A.D. 1558.

THE Reformation, properly so called, can scarcely be said to have made any progress in Ireland in the reign of Henry VIII. Though that monarch repudiated the dogma of the papal supremacy, he continued, as we have seen, till his death to adhere to almost all the other errors of Romanism; and those who ventured to deviate from his creed, could not reckon even on toleration. In the reign of his son and successor Edward VI., some important movements were made in the way of improvement; but the youth of the sovereign, his premature demise, the unsettled state of public affairs, and the want of evangelical preachers, all interfered with the vigorous development of the plans of the reformers.

Whilst the spiritual principles of Protestantism remained almost unknown, there was a party in the country anticipating their appearance, and prepared to resist their advances. We have stated[2] that, as early as 1541, provision had been made for the appearance of the Jesuits in Ireland. Their patron —Waucop, the Popish Primate of Armagh, who died in Paris in 1551 in a convent of the order—does not seem to have been much in this country after he became Romish metropolitan.[3] But he contributed greatly to stir up a spirit of

---

[1] Edward VI., A.D. 1547 to A.D. 1553; Mary, A.D. 1553 to A.D. 1558.

[2] See preceding chapter, p. 351.

[3] He was present at the Council of Trent during its sittings from 1545 to 1547. Brenan, p. 397.

resistance to Protestantism. Paul III., the reigning Pope, had his attention now earnestly directed to the state of the western isle; and he encouraged Waucop to plant the Jesuits in the country. John Codure—the first member of that Society appointed to come here—was removed by death; but his place was supplied by Alphonsus Salmeron, Pasquier Brouet, and Francis Zapata.[1] In Ireland these men found a most appropriate field for the exercise of all their zeal, cunning, and diplomacy. Taking advantage of the antipathy of the old Irish chiefs to English rule, they endeavoured to induce them to believe that, if they gave any countenance to heresy, national freedom was impossible. They assured them that, if they stood out against Protestantism, they might expect support from the great princes of the Continent in their struggle for independence. The Irish dynasts were not theologians; and they had no great reason to respect the Pope—for he had brought them into the very thraldom from which they now sought deliverance; but they saw that he could render them good service in their political movements, by inducing the Emperor of Germany, or the King of France, to come to their assistance. Thus it was that, before Protestantism could be fairly submitted to the consideration of the Irish people, many of them had made up their minds for its rejection. The very system which was fitted to deliver them from spiritual tyranny was associated in their imaginations with subjection to the hated yoke of England. The Jesuits did their utmost, not only to foster this prejudice, but also to obtain from abroad the substantial aid without which the natives could not free themselves from British domination.

Even before the appearance of the Jesuits in Ireland, the steps taken by the Pope to oppose the progress of the Reformation had not been without influence. He had threatened with excommunication all churchmen who dared to yield to the commands of Henry VIII.; and, in consequence, as early as 1538, several incumbents in the diocese of Dublin had resigned their livings rather than acknowledge

[1] Brenan, p. 397; Cox, p. 272. See also Nicolini's *Hist. of the Jesuits*, p. 68.

the royal supremacy.[1] For upwards of three years after the commencement of the reign of Edward VI., no change was made in the ecclesiastical arrangements of Ireland; and meanwhile, the adherents of Roman Catholicism had time to consolidate their strength, and to prepare for an approaching crisis. Whilst there were no Protestant preachers to expound the Gospel to the people in their own tongue,[2] the partizans of the Pope traversed the country; depicted in the darkest colours the abominations of the new doctrines; and exhorted all, who had any concern for their salvation, to oppose them to the uttermost. The natives were told that the Bishop of Rome was their great friend and patron; that he had given their land to Henry II.; and that, if the King of England now disowned the papal jurisdiction, they were released from the obligation of allegiance. In other countries Protestantism made way among the people by the light of its own evidence; but in Ireland it had, for ages, few evangelists to exhibit its credentials; and, when it at length appeared under more favourable auspices, the mass of the inhabitants were already determined to close their eyes against its illumination.

At this period the Irish secular clergy, with very few exceptions, were extremely ignorant and careless. Even the trouble involved in the use of formularies, to which they had never been accustomed, was enough to make them averse to a change. Those of them who valued their office chiefly because of its emoluments were bitterly hostile to the Reformation; for its theology completely dried up some of the sources of their income. Under its teaching, the fees heretofore derived from the deliverance of souls from purgatory, and other such services,[3] entirely disappeared. On other grounds the clergy had good reason to complain. In the reign of Edward VI. Protestantism was introduced into Ireland in a way not at all fitted to promote its acceptance.

---

[1] Leland, ii. 170, 193.

[2] *Ibid.*, ii. 193-4. The Viceroy St. Leger, after his appointment, informed the Council in London "that there had been *but one sermon* made in the country *for three years*, and that by the Bishop of Meath."—FROUDE, v. 419, *note*.

[3] See a number of these sources of income mentioned in Malone's *Church History of Ireland*, pp. 190-191.

The changes made in the ritual had not even the sanction of an Act of Parliament. A royal order, dated February 1551, and addressed to the Viceroy, Sir Anthony St. Leger, commanded that the English liturgy should henceforth be used in public worship.[1] The Lord Deputy, to whom this mandate was directed, and who was sent into Ireland to superintend its execution, had so little zeal for its enforcement that, after his arrival in Dublin, he permitted high mass to be celebrated in Christ Church Cathedral; and was himself present at the service.[2] To save appearances, a proclamation was issued enjoining the use of the English Book of Common Prayer; but the proclamation was disregarded; and disobedience was overlooked.[3] The new ritual was adopted only in the comparatively few places where the officiating clergy espoused the cause of the Reformation.

In the reign of Edward several prelates favourable to Protestantism were added to the Irish hierarchy. Among these may be mentioned Lancaster of Kildare, Casey of Limerick, Bale of Ossory, and Goodacre of Armagh. Dowdall, who had been appointed by Henry VIII. to the See of Armagh on the death of Cromer, opposed all reform; and his steadfast adherence to the cause of Popery brought down on him the displeasure of the Court. By way of rebuke, the title of Primate of all Ireland was withdrawn from him, and conferred on his rival, Archbishop Browne of Dublin.[4] Dowdall, prob-

---

[1] King, ii. 720. There was no Parliament held in Ireland in the reign of Edward VI.

[2] Froude, v. 425.

[3] The proclamation stated that the prayers of the Church had been *translated* for the edification of the people—without mention of any alterations. Dowdall, the Armagh Primate, opposed the English Liturgy on the ground that every illiterate fellow would now be able to read mass. St. Leger replied that there were too many illiterate priests, as ignorant of the language in which the service had been hitherto performed as the people who attended.—Leland, ii. 195-6. The proclamation makes mention of the translation of the Scriptures into English, so that some copies of the English Bible were now probably to be found in Ireland. See Mant, i. 193.

[4] In 1551 Dowdall and Staples, Bishop of Meath, had a controversial discussion in Mary's Abbey, Dublin, on the points in dispute between Romanists and Protestants. This discussion, like many others of the same character, led to no important results. See an account of it in Mant, i. 208-11. See also Haverty, p. 377.

ably suspecting that this token of royal displeasure was only the harbinger of some heavier visitation, deemed it prudent to leave the country; and fled to the continent. Goodacre, a zealous Protestant, was advanced to the Primacy, and consecrated on the 2nd of February, 1553; but he survived his investiture only about three months. According to a well-informed contemporary, he was "poisoned at Dublin by procurement of certain priests of his diocese for preaching God's verity and rebuking their common vices."[1] Bale, who was consecrated along with him, was permitted only for a short time to perform his episcopal duties. After the death of Edward, in the following summer, he found it no longer possible to maintain his position; and contrived with difficulty to make his escape into Switzerland. But Bale was by far the ablest and most accomplished champion of Protestantism who had yet appeared in Ireland. He was born in 1495 in the county of Suffolk; and in early life had joined the fraternity of the Carmelites. He was educated at Cambridge; and when the principles of the Reformation began to spread in England, he embraced them with great enthusiasm. His zeal, as a preacher of the new doctrines, exposed him to much danger; and twice during the reign of Henry VIII. he was thrown into prison—first by the Archbishop of York, and then by the Bishop of London; but on both occasions Lord Cromwell interposed and procured his liberation. He at length found it necessary to retire to the Continent—where he remained eight years, and where he enjoyed the friendship of Luther, Calvin, and others of the Protestant leaders. When Edward was on the throne he returned to England; and, at the earnest request of the young King himself, accepted the Bishopric of Ossory. He was now verging on

---

[1] *The Vocacyon of Johan Bale to the bisshoprick of Ossorie, &c.*, p. 343. Printed 1553. Mant, apparently without any good reason, throws doubts on this statement. It is corroborated by Burnet, who says:—"A reverend and worthy clergyman of Hampshire not far from Salisbury (who is the fourth in descent from that Primate, they having been all clergymen but one) told me he had it from his grandfather—who was the Primate's grandson—that he, being invited to a Popish lord's house, a monk there drank to him, in a poisoned liquor, on design to poison him—of which they both died."—BURNET'S *Reformation*, iii. 325. London, 1841.

threescore years of age; and his constitution had suffered from the hardships he had undergone; but he girded himself, like a true evangelist, for the performance of the onerous task he had undertaken. Even at the time of his induction he displayed his decision of character. Lockwood, Dean of Christchurch, Dublin, proposed that the Roman ritual should be used on the occasion—as the people disliked the Reformed Liturgy,[1] and as the new mode of consecration had not been sanctioned by any Act of an Irish Parliament. Archbishop Browne, who was to preside, supported Lockwood; other prelates who were present concurred; and even Goodacre, who was to be consecrated at the same time, was disposed to acquiesce. But Bale remained inflexible. His firmness prevailed; and though the new form of service was employed, the dangers which had been predicted proved visionary—as the occasion passed off without any disturbance.

On his arrival in his diocese Bale addressed himself with great zeal to the business of public instruction. "My first proceedings," says he, "were these: I earnestly exhorted the people to repentance for sin, and required them to give credit to the gospel of salvation; to acknowledge and believe that there is but one God, and Him alone, without any other, sincerely to worship; to confess one Christ for an only Saviour and Redeemer, and to trust in none other man's prayers, merits, nor yet deservings, but in His alone for salvation. . . . Helpers I found none among my prebendaries and clergy, but adversaries a great number. I preached the gospel of the knowledge and right invocation of God. But when I once sought to destroy the idolatries, and dissolve the hypocrites' yokes, then followed angers, slanders, conspiracies, and, in the end, the slaughter of men. Much ado I had with the priests; for that I had said, among other, that the white gods of their making, such as they

[1] Cox states (*Hib. Anglic.* p. 291) that in 1551 "the English Liturgy with orders and rules for ecclesiastical habits and ceremonies was reprinted at Dublin by Humphry Powel." One copy of this edition is in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin.—Mant, i. 205. Powel, who was originally a London printer, had now settled in Ireland. See *Ecc. Hist. Soc. Book of Common Prayer for Ireland*, i. Int. vi. London, 1849.

offered to the people to be worshipped, were no gods, but idols; and that their prayers for the dead procured no redemption to the souls departed, redemption of souls being only in Christ, of Christ, and by Christ. I added that their office, by Christ's straight commandment, was chiefly to preach and instruct the people in the doctrine and way of God, and not to occupy so much of the time in chaunting, piping, and singing." [1] Bale had also occasion to rebuke the gross licentiousness of his clergy.[2] By some he has been blamed for his acrimony; but his honesty and courage were unquestionable; and those who have found fault with the severe terms in which he occasionally gives utterance to his sentiments, have not perhaps made fair allowance for the very difficult position which he occupied. In testifying against the gross superstition which he saw everywhere around him, he felt it necessary to utter no uncertain sound; and though he soon encountered bitter opposition, he seems to have obtained credit for sincerity and earnestness. In Ireland religion and politics were already strangely confounded; and the acerbity of theological discussion was thus greatly aggravated; for every one who attacked the Pope was sure to offend all who were looking to him for military succour. Bale was at once felt to be a most formidable assailant of Romanism; he spoke with a tongue of fire; and hence the deadly hostility with which he was confronted.

This good man filled the See of Ossory only a few months; but even in that short period his labours made no inconsiderable impression. It was not unusual in the sixteenth century for the teachers of the people to endeavour to attract public attention by dramatic representations; and the Protestant Bishop sought in this way to interest the inhabitants of Kilkenny. We are told, for example, how a company of young men under his care acted "a tragedy of God's promises in the old law at the market cross," and "a comedy of St. John the Baptist's preachings, of Christ's baptizing, and of His temptation in the wilderness, to the small contentation of the priests

[1] Bale's *Vocacyon*, p. 342.

[2] See Reid's *Hist. of the Presb. Church in Ireland*, i. 11, *notes* 27 and 28, and p. 38.

and other Papists."[1] By these performances Bale sought to blend amusement with instruction, and to enlist the rising generation on the side of Protestantism. But the announcement of Mary's accession to the throne so emboldened the Papal party, that he found it no longer safe to remain in his diocese. About two months after the death of Edward, five of the Bishop's servants were barbarously murdered in the immediate neighbourhood of his residence; his house was attacked by an infuriated mob—among whom several priests were conspicuous: and he would have lost his life had not the chief magistrate of Kilkenny hastened to his aid with a large force of military.[2] Protected by a strong escort, he was conveyed by night to Kilkenny. The account which he gives of this critical adventure shows that his labours had been appreciated by at least some of those among whom he ministered. He tells us that "the young men" sang "psalms and other godly songs in rejoice of his deliverance," and that "the people in great number stood on both sides of the way, both within the gates and without, with candles lighted in their hands, shouting out praises to God for delivering" him "from the hands of these murderers."[3] Such facts attest that, though the priestly party exhibited a most diabolical spirit, he had already secured no small amount of popular sympathy. But he knew that he could not expect protection under the government of Mary; and, leaving Ireland,[4] he made his way to Basle, where he remained until the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth. He then returned to England; but he declined to resume the charge of the See

---

[1] Bale's *Vocacyon*, p. 345. See also Reid's *Presby. Church in Ireland*, i. 38, *note*, ed. 1867.

[2] Harris's *Ware*, i. 416. [3] Reid, i. 39.

[4] He is said to have left behind him at Kilkenny "a well furnished library."—Harris's *Ware*, i. 416. We afterwards find Queen Elizabeth writing to St. Leger to "send over the books and writings of Bale, a man that hath been studious in the search for the history and antiquities of this our realm, which he left behind him, in the time of our late sister Queen Mary, when he was occasioned to depart out of Ireland, for the illustration and setting forth of the story of this our realm."—*Calendar of the Patent and Close Rolls of Chancery in Ireland in the reigns of Henry VIII. &c.*, by Morrin, vol. i., preface, xli. Dublin, 1861.

of Ossory. The Queen conferred on him a prebend in Canterbury, where he died in November, 1563.[1]

We are told that "when a man's ways please the Lord, He maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him."[2] The comparative tranquillity which prevailed in Ireland during the whole of the reign of Edward VI. supplies a striking illustration of the truth of this divine apothegm. The young prince was perhaps the most pious monarch England had ever yet seen; and it appeared as if his enemies in this country had no power to disturb his government. Though the French Court kept up a correspondence with the disaffected,[3] and though various other agencies were at work to stir up rebellion, Sir Thomas Cusack, the Lord Chancellor, in a report to the Duke of Northumberland, written about two months before Edward's death, represents the kingdom as in a state of unusual quietude. "Munster," he states, "under the rule of such lords and captains as be there, and of the Earl of Desmond, is in good quiet; so that the Justices of the Peace ride their circuits in the counties of Limerick, Cork, and Kerry, being the farthest shires west in Munster; and the sheriffs are obeyed. . . . Irishmen were never so weak, and the English subjects never so strong as now."[4] But the writer at the same time bitterly deplores the want of a suitable ministry. "Hard it is," says he, "for men to know their duties to God and to the King, when they shall not hear preaching or teaching throughout all the year to edify the poor ignorant to know his duty. . . . As for preaching, *we have none*, which is our most lack, without which the ignorant can have no knowledge."[5]

During the reign of Edward the reformed faith made very little progress in Ireland. The English liturgy was read in a few garrison towns, but elsewhere it was neglected; and, even in some places where it was employed, it was unintelligible to the people; as they understood only their native language. The Lord Deputy was instructed to have it

---

[1] Harris's *Ware*, i. 417.

[2] Prov. xvi. 7.

[3] See Richey's *Lectures*, second series, p. 194.

[4] *Carew MSS.*, vol. i. 235-246.

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 240-1-6.

translated into Irish;[1] but so gross was the mismanagement in almost all matters relating to religion, that an order of such obvious importance was not carried into execution. Whilst the Jesuits and other agents of the Pope were travelling all over the country, addressing the multitude, appealing to their worst passions, defending the peculiarities of Romanism, and misrepresenting the Protestant theology, the reformed party had no preachers to put forward on the other side; so that the natives became more and more wedded to their old superstitions. A single individual, even with the gifts and zeal of Bale, could make little way against the clergy of a nation—more especially when very few of the laity could read, and when the press could not be brought into requisition.

The accession of Mary gave a new impulse to the activity and confidence of the Romanists. Shortly afterwards, a proclamation was issued sanctioning the celebration of the Mass;[2] and, as the See of Armagh had become vacant by the death of Goodacre, George Dowdall, who had withdrawn to the Continent in the reign of Edward, now returned, and was reinstated as Metropolitan. At the same time the title of Primate of all Ireland was restored to the Northern Archbishop. In the spring of 1554 a commission was issued to Dowdall and others, empowering them to set aside the married prelates and clergy. Staples of Meath was the first Bishop who suffered deprivation; and William Walsh, one of the Commissioners, was soon afterwards promoted to the vacant dignity. Browne, Archbishop of Dublin, Lancaster Bishop of Kildare, Travers Bishop of Leighlin, and Casey Bishop of Limerick,[3] were also set aside. Dowdall was exceedingly active in the restoration of Popery. In 1554 he presided at a provincial Synod in Drogheda, where a variety

---

[1] Cox, p. 290; Lingard, vii. 90.

[2] Cox, p. 298.

[3] According to some, Casey left the country shortly after the accession of Mary. He was restored to his See in the reign of Elizabeth, and lived till February 1591. —Harris's *Ware*, i. 511. Some of the Bishops—such as Magennis of Down and Connor, and De Burgo, or Burke of Clonfert—kept their places during all the changes of religion in the reigns of Henry VIII., Edward VI., Mary, and Elizabeth —Magennis died in 1563; and Burke, in 1580.

of constitutions were adopted calculated to impart to it increased vigour. One of the enactments of this ecclesiastical convention is specially worthy of remembrance. The Irish Protestants had hitherto enjoyed the services of only three or four preachers; and even some of these rarely delivered a discourse[1]—so that the disadvantageous circumstances under which the reformed faith was introduced into the country could not fail to attract the notice of all intelligent observers. The Romanists, it is true, had very few ecclesiastics of any pretensions to literary culture: but all could speak the vulgar tongue; and some of them, in strains of rude eloquence, could impressively harangue an uneducated audience. In those days, when preaching was so rare, and when the service was conducted in a dead language, a discourse which all could understand was vastly appreciated: and Dowdall resolved to anticipate the Reformers by endeavouring to make the pulpit more effective. It was accordingly ordained in the Synod of Drogheda that all rectors and vicars, who did not know how to preach, must hire some one to preach for them four times a year.[2]

Hugh Curwin, who was a native of Westmoreland and one of the chaplains of Queen Mary, was selected to succeed George Browne, the deprived Archbishop of Dublin. Curwin was consecrated at London House, on the 8th of September, 1555, by Edward Bonner Bishop of London, Thomas Thirlby Bishop of Ely, and Maurice Griffin Bishop of Rochester.[3] This Archbishop of Dublin—who was immediately appointed Lord Chancellor—occupies a remarkable position in the Irish Episcopate; for a certain class of writers, who attach unspeakable importance to the conservation of what they call "the Episcopal Succession," point to him as the grand link

---

[1] Bale intimates that Archbishop Browne preached only twice in the year. See preceding chapter, p. 341, *note* (3).

[2] Harris's *Ware*, i. 92. At this time the churches were almost everywhere in a ruinous condition. In 1556 Lord Fitzwalter describes them to Queen Mary as "liker to stables for horses and herdhouses for cattle than holy places to minister with due reverence the blessed sacraments in."—*Calendar of State Papers*, Ireland. Mary, 1553, 1558, p. 135.

[3] Brady's *Irish Reformation*, p. 88. Fifth edition.

uniting the Protestant hierarchy to their old Popish predecessors. As Bonner of bloody memory presided at the consecration of Curwin, some might be disposed to think that a sacred commission, obtained through one who has left behind him a reputation so odious, must be a title of very equivocal value: but there are those who imagine that even such credentials may be indispensable to a minister of the Gospel. They have accordingly been at great pains to trace the episcopal descent of Hugh Curwin from the ancient Hibernian hierarchy; and they have thus sought to connect officially the present Protestant prelates with the church of Ireland before the Reformation.[1] But the attempt has been signally unsuccessful. Bonner and the Bishops who joined with him in the consecration of Curwin were all Englishmen; and it cannot be proved that even one of them derived his orders from a prelate ordained in Ireland.[2] A genuine minister of Christ does not require to establish his claim to the sacred office by the exhibition of musty records of fallible authority: no man on earth can historically trace his descent from the Apostles by an unbroken chain of unimpeachable ordinations; and were it even possible for any one to produce such genealogies—extending back to the very days of Paul and Peter—he would not prove that he was an accredited herald of the Cross, if he did not preach "the glorious Gospel of the blessed God."

---

[1] An elaborate attempt of this kind has been made by Dr. A. T. Lee in his *Irish Episcopal Succession*, pp. 44, 77, 78. Dublin, 1867.

[2] Dr. A. T. Lee has endeavoured to trace the descent of Hugh Curwin from the ancient Irish hierarchy in the following manner:—Among the consecrators of Edmund Bonner was Richard Sampson, Bishop of Chichester: among the consecrators of Richard Sampson was John Voysey, Bishop of Exeter: and among the consecrators of John Voysey was Thomas Halsay, Bishop of Leighlin.—*The Irish Epis. Succession*, p. 44. Dr. Lee argues that Curwin was a branch of the old Irish Episcopate because, among a crowd of names of those who were his ecclesiastical progenitors, he has been able, after much research, to discover one remotely related to him who was Bishop of an Irish See. It unfortunately happens, however, that this Thomas Halsay was not himself of the old Irish stock of bishops, for *he never saw his diocese.* He was an Englishman by birth, and he was ordained in Rome. See Harris's *Ware*, i. 460, and Brady's *Irish Reformation.* Introd. p. xix. Such are the miserable shifts by which some have tried to establish the figment of an Irish apostolical succession. See before, Book i., p. 101.

About the time that Curwin was consecrated, other ecclesiastics, supposed to be staunch supporters of Romanism, were appointed to Sees in Ireland left vacant by death or deprivation.[1] In May 1556 Viscount Fitzwalter entered on his duties as Viceroy; and the instructions received by him from his royal mistress sufficiently indicated her determination sternly to oppose Protestantism. The Lord Deputy and his council were required "by their example and all good means possible, to advance the honour of God and the Catholic Faith, to set forth the honour and dignity of the Pope's Holiness and See Apostolic of Rome; and from time to time to be ready, with their aid and secular force, at the request of all spiritual ministers and ordinaries, to punish and repress all heretics, and Lollards, and their damnable sects, opinions, and errors."[2] When the Irish Parliament met in the June of the same year, a papal bull was delivered by the Viceroy to Archbishop Curwin, the Lord Chancellor; the obsequious Primate received and read the document, in presence of the assembled Senators, on his knees: and the Lords and Commons, in the same devout attitude, promised to yield submission. An Act was now passed setting forth that the title of "Supreme Head of the Church" was "not to be justly attributable to any King or Governor;" and ordaining that "the Pope's Holiness and the See Apostolic" were "to have and enjoy such authority, pre-eminence, and jurisdiction, as His Holiness used and exercised, or might have lawfully used and exercised by the authority of His supremacy" in the early part of the reign of Henry VIII.[3] Another Act of the same Parliament provided for the punishment of heretics. It revived three statutes made in the reigns of Richard II., Henry IV., and Henry V., which declared that "all persons preaching or teaching, or evidently suspected of preaching or teaching against the Catholic Faith," might be arrested by the diocesan, tried at his discretion, and refusing to abjure or relapsing—delivered to the secular arm, and *burnt for the terror of others*."[4]

---

[1] Mant, i. 240.

[2] Cox, p. 303.

[3] The 3rd and 4th of Philip and Mary, chap. viii.

[4] Mant, i. 246. The Act is the 3rd and 4th of Philip and Mary, chap. ix., and

It is obvious from these enactments that Mary was quite prepared to carry out in Ireland the same sanguinary policy which spread such terror throughout England. But we read of no scenes of martyrdom—partly because there were few decided Protestants in the island, and partly because those whose business it was to repress heresy were not very vigilant or zealous in performing the duties of their odious office. During the reigns of Edward and Mary, the government of the country was entrusted to men who were not decidedly attached to any form of worship. Sir Anthony St. Leger, who carried out the reforms of Edward, was employed in the beginning of the reign of Mary to re-establish Romanism;[1] and the Earl of Sussex, who was Viceroy for two years before the death of the bloody Queen, was commissioned, in the following reign, to overturn what he had so deliberately sanctioned.[2] Rulers of such an accommodating character could not be expected to be very ardent in the cause of either Popery or Protestantism. So lax was the administration of the law that some, who were obliged to flee from persecution in South Britain, found an asylum in this country.[3] Mary, it appears, shortly before her death, resolved to stimulate the Irish government to severity; but her intentions were providentially frustrated. The bearer of her commission lost the document on his way to Dublin: and, before a fresh order could be provided, the Queen was no more.[4]

---

is entitled "An Act for Reviving of Three Statutes made for the Punishment of Heresies." In this same Parliament a law was made which is more worthy of record. This is the 3rd and 4th of Philip and Mary, chap. vii., and is entitled "An Act Against Making of *Aqua Vitae*."

[1] Leland, ii. 207. [2] King, ii. 748.

[3] Ware's *Annals*, A.D. 1554. Ware states that some Cheshire Protestants, viz., John Harvey, Abel Ellis, John Edmunds, and Henry Haugh, settled in Dublin, and had a Welshman, named Thomas Jones, for their minister. The existence of this society was not made public until after the death of Queen Mary.

[4] The account of this affair is that Dr. Cole, the bearer of the commission, when passing through Chester, incontinently divulged his errand; and that the good woman who kept the lodging where he sojourned, and who favoured the Protestants, contrived surreptitiously to obtain possession of the document. Dr. Cole did not discover his loss until his arrival in Dublin. Archbishop Ussher is said to be the voucher for the truth of this narrative. See Ware's *Annals*, A.D. 1558.

It is a significant fact that, during the reign of Mary, Ireland was as disturbed as at any former period.[1] The Queen and her subjects were united in the recognition of Papal authority, so that religion could not be assigned as an apology for revolt; but the Viceroy, notwithstanding, was almost constantly employed in suppressing insurrection. As Mary was married to Philip of Spain, the most powerful prince in Europe, the Irish now looked in vain to the continent for aid to enable them to sever their connection with England: but still they fretted under the hated yoke. The old feuds of the chieftains were maintained with unabated violence; and O'Neill, the great dynast of Ulster—on whom the Pope in the reign of Henry VIII. had heaped so many flattering epithets—was now seized and imprisoned by the British government.[2]

In this reign the appropriation of monastic property to secular uses was continued. Many abbey lands were now granted by the Crown to courtiers and others.[3] It is somewhat remarkable that the system of colonization—afterwards so largely employed in Ireland—was inaugurated under the administration of this Roman Catholic sovereign. The expulsion of the natives from their settlements, to make room for strangers from Great Britain, has often been represented as part of the peculiar policy of Protestantism; but the statement is quite unfounded. Whatever may be thought of the propriety of the arrangement, we cannot ignore the historical fact that it was first authoritatively carried into operation under the government of Mary. Offaly, Leix, and the adjoining

---

[1] This fact is noticed by Cox (p. 309) and admitted even by R.C. writers. See Macgeoghegan, p. 447. In a letter from Primate Dowdall to the Privy Council of England, the year before Mary's death, the writer says:—"This poor realm was never in my remembrance in worse case than it is now, except the time only that O'Neill and O'Donnel invaded the English Pale and burnt a great piece of it. The North is as far out of frame as ever it was before."—Archbishop of Armagh to Archbishop of York, the Lord Chancellor and the Privy Council (Nov. 15th, 1557). *Cal. State Papers*, Ireland, vol. i., p. 140.

[2] Leland, ii. 204.

[3] See Richey's *Lectures*, second series, pp. 237, 238, 241. As an exception to the general policy of this reign, the Priory of Kilmainham was restored to its former possessors in 1557. The new Prior fled from the country on the accession of Elizabeth. *Ibid.* p. 242, *note.*

districts—inhabited by the O'Connors, O'Dempsys, O'Mores, and other native tribes—lay on the borders of the Pale: and their woods and bogs sheltered a race of fierce freebooters, who were for ages the constant terror of the neighbouring Anglo-Irish population. In the reign of Edward VI. their insubordination received a decisive check; and their country was now formed into shire-ground. The reclaimed territory was designated King's County and Queen's County; and their capitals of Philipstown and Maryborough still preserve the names of the reigning princes. By an Act passed in the Parliament which met in 1556,[1] the Lord Deputy was empowered to grant to Englishmen such "estates in fee simple" of the lordships and manors of the said countries, "as for the more sure planting and strengthening of them with good subjects, should be thought unto his wisdom and discretion meet and convenient." Englishmen were, in consequence, settled in this part of Ireland; but the plantation long kept the country in a wretched condition. "Atrocities were committed," says a late writer, "which have not yet been forgotten. At Mullaghmast the English settlers, by a preconcerted plan, massacred the Irish whom they had decoyed to a conference.[2] In 1557 Connal O'More was executed with peculiar brutality on Leighlin bridge; in retaliation, the natives robbed, burned, and slew the settlers when opportunity offered. The merciless struggle went on far into Elizabeth's reign between the natives and the colonists, until the Celtic tribes, decimated and utterly savage, sunk to the level of banditti, and ultimately disappeared."[3]

---

[1] The 3rd and 4th of Philip and Mary, chap. i.

[2] "It is," says Dr. O'Donovan, "incontrovertible that the most powerfu families *on both sides* were Roman Catholics."—O'Donovan's *Four Masters*, vol. v., p. 1696, *note.*

[3] Richey's *Lectures*, second series, pp. 255-6.

CHAPTER III.

FROM THE ACCESSION OF ELIZABETH TO THE DEATH OF SHANE O'NEILL. A.D. 1558 TO A.D. 1567.

THE accession of Elizabeth to the throne opened up a new prospect to the Church of Ireland. Though this young princess in the time of Mary had partially conformed to the Mass, it was understood that she had merely succumbed during a reign of terror, and that in due time she would proclaim her attachment to Protestantism. The more zealous reformers had not much confidence in the strength of her religious convictions; and to the last she exhibited a leaning to some of the peculiarities of Popery; but political considerations conspired with her early training to decide the somewhat wavering balance of her ecclesiastical choice. Her title to the Crown would have been compromised by her submission to the Bishop of Rome—as she would thus have virtually declared herself illegitimate. She soon exhibited her determination to change the re-established worship; and, a few months after her coronation, orders were sent to Ireland "to new paint the walls of Christ Church and St. Patrick's; and, instead of pictures and Popish fancies, to place passages or texts of Scripture on the walls."[1] When the Earl of Sussex made his first appearance in a Dublin cathedral on his re-appointment as Lord Deputy "the Litany was sung in English."[2] These things alarmed the Romanists; and, as it was deemed most desirable to put a stop at once to innovation, a monk of the metropolis resolved to try the experiment

[1] *Loftus MS.* quoted by Mant, i. 253.

[2] Mant, i. 253.

of a miracle. There stood in the cathedral a marble image with a reed in its hand and a crown of thorns on its head. This image enjoyed high renown, and marvellous tales were told in illustration of its sanctity. When the Viceroy on the following Lord's Day attended divine service, its appearance created a great sensation. It was observed that the face presented an unusual aspect, and very soon the startling announcement spread through the assembly that the image was sweating blood! Dismay prevailed: the people fell on their knees and beat their breasts; and many anxiously sought to know the cause of this strange occurrence. The contriver of the wonder—who took care to be among the auditory—was ready with an explanation. "Christ," said he, "could not choose but sweat blood whilst heresy was then come into the Church." The confusion now increased: not a few prostrated themselves before the image; and the Lord Deputy with the Council abruptly left the place. But Curwin, Archbishop of Dublin, who had probably witnessed such tricks before, and who was now prepared to pass over to Protestantism, retained his self-possession. He desired the sexton to mount a form which was at hand, and to wash the face of the image, so that he might see whether it would bleed afresh. As soon as the man came into close contact with the marble figure he discovered the cheat; for he found, behind the crown of thorns on the head, a large sponge saturated with blood! That morning, before the commencement of the service, a monk named Leigh, the inventor of the miracle, had obtained access to the church: and, with the assistance of some others, had placed this sponge, soaked in a bowl of blood supplied by the butcher, in the position which it now occupied. It soon began to discharge some of its contents; and thus it was that the face of the image exhibited the appearance which had caused so much alarm. The detection of the imposture opened the eyes of the multitude, and contributed greatly to the advancement of Protestantism. It is said to have led to the conversion of above one hundred persons present,[1] who vowed that they would never hear mass

[1] Strype's *Life of Archbishop Parker*, vol. i., p. 90. Oxf. edit. It is said that at the accession of Elizabeth there were not sixty Protestants in all Ireland, so that

more. Nor did the monk and his accomplices escape. On the three following Lord's Days they were obliged to do penance by standing on a table before the pulpit in Christ Church "with their hands and legs tied, and their crime written on their breasts."[1]

When the penitents appeared in this sad plight for the first time before the congregation, Archbishop Curwin improved the opportunity by delivering a discourse, in which he pointed out the folly of those who suffered themselves to be deluded by such lying miracles. His presence of mind had led to the detection of the jugglery; but, after all, he was entitled to very little credit as a friend of the Reformation. He acted throughout life the part of a time-server. In the days of Archbishop Browne this very image had been removed from the cathedral; but Curwin, on his arrival in Dublin, had caused it to be replaced; and, during the reign of Mary, he had sanctioned all her proceedings for the restoration of Romanism. In the time of Henry VIII. he had been equally accommodating. He then defended the supremacy of the Crown, and vindicated Henry's marriage with Anne Boleyn. When the pious Frith was in prison for denying purgatory and transubstantiation, Curwin preached against him in the royal presence; and thus stimulated the King to sign the death-warrant for his martyrdom.[2] The Primate now made another evolution; caused the replaced image to be broken down; and superintended the re-establishment of Protestantism! Such, according to some, is one of the most precious links of the Irish episcopal succession! He has been described by another Protestant Archbishop,[3] who knew him well, as a man guilty of "open crimes" as well as of religious inconsistency. In 1567 he was removed from Dublin to Oxford; but he survived his translation only a year.[4]

About the time of the accession of Elizabeth, Heath, Archbishop of York, presented a large English Bible to each of the

---

the accession of so many converts was a fact of some significance. See *Pictorial History of England*, vol. vii. 192.

[1] Mant, i. 256; Collier, *Ecc. Hist. of Great Britain*, vi. 261.

[2] Mant, i. 239; Brenan, p. 172.

[3] Archbishop Loftus. See Mant, i. 281.

[4] Harris's *Ware*, i. 353.

two Dublin Cathedrals.[1] The sacred volume appears at this time to have been almost unknown in Ireland; and many now discovered an anxiety to become acquainted with its contents. The gift of these Bibles is remarkable; for the donor was so decided a Romanist that he submitted to deprivation rather than accede to the religious changes introduced by Elizabeth. But he was one of the worthiest of his party.[2] At the time of the accession of the new Queen, he was Lord Chancellor of England; and it is not improbable that he made the donation at the suggestion of his royal mistress. The Bibles, on their arrival in Dublin, were vastly prized. They were used at Cathedral worship, and at other times were accessible to the public. The citizens came in crowds to listen to some one reading the holy volume. What they heard awakened an increased desire for information; and a demand for an additional supply of copies soon followed. In 1566 John Dale, a Dublin bookseller, imported a number of small Bibles, then first printed; and within two years sold no less than seven thousand.[3]

In the spring of 1559 Protestantism was re-established in South Britain by authority of Parliament; and the colonial government, as we have seen, shortly afterwards received instructions to set up the Reformed worship in Ireland. In January, 1560, a Parliament assembled in Dublin to give its sanction to these injunctions.[4] An Act was passed "restoring to the Crown the ancient jurisdiction over the State, ecclesiastical and spiritual, and abrogating all foreign power repugnant to the same;"[5] the Act for reviving the three statutes

---

[1] Ware's *Annals*, A.D. 1559.

[2] Collier mentions that, after his deprivation, the Queen sometimes visited him in his retirement.—*Ecc. Hist. of Great Britain*, vol. vi. 251. Ed. 1840.

[3] Reid's *Hist. of Presb. Church in Ireland*, i. 44.

[4] There were at this time only seventy-six or seventy-eight members in the Irish House of Commons. See *Liber Munerum Hiberniae*, part vii., p. 161; and *Tracts Relating to Ireland*, vol. ii., p. 136. Dublin, 1843. Of the places represented, twenty-eight or twenty-nine were cities or boroughs, each returning two members. The borough members were generally the mere creatures of government. Only ten counties now returned members to the Irish Parliament.

[5] 2nd of Eliz., chap. 1. The penalties annexed to the transgression of this Act were to ecclesiastics, for the first offence, loss of benefices; for the second offence,

made for the punishment of heretics was repealed; and the oath of supremacy, acknowledging the Queen and her successors to be the only supreme governors of the realm and renouncing all foreign jurisdiction, was required to be taken by all ecclesiastical persons on pain of forfeiture of office. This Parliament also passed an Act "for the uniformity of Common Prayer and service in the Church, and the administration of the sacraments."[1] According to this statute the second Prayer Book of King Edward VI., with certain alterations and additions, was to be used in all the cathedral and parish churches of the kingdom. All ministers were commanded to adopt it; and any one who refused, or employed another form, or preached or spoke in derogation of it, incurred graduated penalties,—for the first offence, forfeiture of a year's profit of his benefice and six months' imprisonment, —for the second offence, imprisonment for one year and deprivation,—for the third offence, deprivation and imprisonment for life. All persons not having reasonable excuse were to resort to their parish churches on all Sundays and holy days, and there abide orderly during the service, on pain of the censures of the Church and a fine of twelve pence[2]—to be levied by the churchwardens for the use of the poor. All archbishops, bishops, and other ordinaries were earnestly required and charged in God's Name to put this Act in execution, and to punish offenders by the censures of the Church. Another most extraordinary provision was introduced into this Act of Parliament. "Forasmuch," says the statute, "as in most places of this realm there cannot be found English ministers to serve in the churches or places appointed for common prayer, or to minister the sacraments to the people, ... it shall be lawful for the common minister or priest to say and use the matins, even-song, celebration of the Lord's

---

the penalties of praemunire; and for the third offence, the penalty of high treason. These penalties were not repealed till 1846. See 9th and 10th of Victoria, chap. lix. No one could be indicted under the 2nd of Eliz., chap. i., for any verbal offence committed more than six months before. § 13.

[1] 2nd of Eliz., chap. 2.

[2] Equal to about ten shillings of our money.

Supper, and administration of each of the sacraments, and all their common and open prayer *in the Latin tongue*, in such form and order as they may be mentioned and set forth in the said book established by this Act, and according to the tenor of this Act, and none otherwise." This Parliament restored the first-fruits and twentieths of ecclesiastical benefices to the Crown;[1] and enacted that, for the future, no writ of *congé d'élire* should be issued for the election of bishops and archbishops; but that all persons collated to such offices by the Queen and her successors must be consecrated and invested, without any other election, by the proper church dignitaries; and that should such dignitaries refuse to invest and consecrate within twenty days, or do anything at variance with the Act, they incurred the penalty of præmunire.[2]

The idea of a legal toleration for dissenters from the worship established by the State had not yet entered into the minds of legislators; and the vested rights of those clergymen who could not conscientiously conform to the new ecclesiastical arrangements are here quite ignored. But the repeal of the statutes for the capital punishment of heretics indicated a disposition on the part of government to treat what were now deemed theological errors with indulgence; and proves clearly that, had the Irish Roman Catholic laity deported themselves as loyal subjects, they had no reason to apprehend any great severity in consequence of their attachment to their ancient ritual. It must, however, be admitted that the enactments placed at this crisis on the statute-book were ill calculated to recommend the alterations in religion to an ignorant and superstitious people. A fine of a shilling a Sunday for absence from church only served to create a prejudice against the reformed worship. Even where there was an inclination

---

[1] 2nd of Eliz., chap. 3.

[2] 2nd of Eliz., chap. 4. What is usually called the statute of præmunire (16th of Richard II., chap. 5) enacts that "whoever procures at Rome or elsewhere any translations, processes, excommunications, Bulls, instruments, or other things which touch the King, against him, his crown, and realm, and all persons aiding and assisting therein, *shall be put out of the King's protection, their lands and goods forfeited to the King's use, and they shall be attached by their bodies to answer to the King and his Council.*"—Blackstone's *Commentaries*, Book iv., c. 8.

to exact the penalty, it could in various ways be easily evaded. But for a long time it was very rarely enforced. In Dublin and two or three other towns it might be occasionally levied by zealous officials. Elsewhere it could not inspire the slightest uneasiness, as there were few Protestant ministers in the country, and still fewer Protestant magistrates or churchwardens.

The provision requiring the service to be read in *Latin*, when a minister acquainted with English could not be obtained, was a preposterous piece of legislation. At the time it was perhaps defended on the ground that the people would thus scarcely challenge the transition from the mass: but if so, it was only fitted to delude them, as well as to perpetuate the reign of ignorance. It does not appear that Government meanwhile took any steps to supply a Latin translation;[1] and as the clergy who did not understand English were incapable of performing the task themselves, we may infer that, in most parts of the island, the mass continued to be celebrated as before. Sound religious instruction was now the great want of Ireland: but at this most important epoch it could with difficulty point to a single ecclesiastic within its borders at all worthy to be called a preacher of the gospel; and even the prayers prescribed for the use of the multitude, had they been provided, must have been unintelligible to almost the whole population.

The Parliament of 1560, which passed these important Acts, sat barely three weeks.[2] It was not attended by a single county member from Ulster or Connaught.[3] The

---

[1] It would appear that, towards the close of 1550, "the whole service of the Communion" was translated into Latin. See Shirley's *Original Letters*, p. 47. London, 1851. This was, however, from the first *Prayer Book* of Edward VI., and it is doubtful whether it was ever printed. A translation from the second *Prayer Book*, according to this Act was at length provided. In a letter from Trollope to Walsingham, dated October 26th, 1587, it is stated that certain of the Irish clergy, of whom a most unfavourable account is given, carried with them to church "a book in Latin of the *Common Prayer*, set forth and allowed by Her Majesty."—*State Papers Concerning the Irish Church*, by W. Maziere Brady, D.D., p. 118. London, 1868.

[2] From the 12th of January to the 1st of February. See Brady's *Irish Reformation*, p. 32.

[3] Carrickfergus was represented by two members, as were also the towns of

Viceroy could reckon on the votes of obsequious senators; and a majority were ready to support his proposals, whatever they might be; but the measures of Government on the subject of religion were strenuously opposed.[1] So many changes in contrary directions had recently been made, that another alteration was regarded with little favour: and, as the Romish party had been long engaged in fortifying their position, they were well prepared with objections and arguments. It is now impossible to ascertain in what way the Bishops voted.[2] According to some accounts the Acts relating to the Church were passed on a day when the Lords Spiritual were engaged elsewhere;[3] and, when they subsequently ventured to remonstrate, they were, it is said, assured by the Deputy that the enforcement of these Statutes was not seriously contemplated.[4] Such statements are suspicious—as they make their appearance for the first time long afterwards;[5] but they may, notwithstanding, contain certain elements of truth. Many of the right reverend Irish churchmen of the

---

Galway and Athenry. These were the only representatives from Ulster and Connaught.

[1] "At the very beginning of this Parliament," says Ware, "Her Majesty's well-wishers found that most of the nobility and Commons were divided in opinion about the ecclesiastical government, which caused the Earl of Essex to dissolve them, and go over to England to consult Her Majesty about the affairs of this kingdom."—*Annals*, A.D. 1559.

[2] Mant asserts that "*all the Lords Spiritual who were present*" dissented from the Bill of Uniformity, i. 707. This is very improbable, and accords ill with other statements of the same writer. We have every reason to think that Curwin was not among the objectors.

[3] See Brady's *Irish Reformation*, fifth edition, p. 32. London, 1867.

[4] See Kelly's *Dissertations on Irish Church History*, p. 351. Dublin, 1864.

[5] Rothe, in his *Analecta Sacra* (p. 431. Coloniae, 1617), is perhaps the earliest propagator of these statements. It has been affirmed that nineteen Bishops were summoned to the Parliament held in Dublin in January 1560, and it has been taken for granted that they all attended. See Dr. A. T. Lee's *Irish Epis. Succession*, p. 73. But the Parliament Roll of 1560 (published in *Tracts Relating to Ireland*, vol. ii., p. 135. Dublin, 1843) is a document of extremely doubtful authority. Some of the Bishops named in it were certainly not present, and the Roll itself bears the name of no clerk or other public functionary to vouch for its authenticity. See Brady's *Irish Reformation*, pp. 180, 181. There is a tradition that the Act of Uniformity was passed by the artifice of Stanyhurst, the Speaker, on a day on which the House was not to sit. See Heron's *Constit. History of the University of Dublin*, p. 26. Dublin, 1847.

beginning of the reign of Elizabeth were dignitaries of easy virtue; and we can well believe that they were not disposed to offend the government by earnestly opposing the ecclesiastical revolution. They may, therefore, have found it convenient to be absent when the bill of uniformity was under consideration. Some of them had retained their places throughout all the changes of the preceding quarter of a century;[1] and, though unwilling to sever their connection with Rome, they may have hoped, by maintaining a prudent silence and by occasional compliances, to avoid the displeasure of the new sovereign. Those who lived outside the Pale, and who were under the protection of chieftains who sympathized with the Pope, had no reason to apprehend disturbance if they failed to come up to the prescribed conformity.

It has often been asserted that, of all the Marian Bishops, only two now remained faithful to Romanism;[2] but the statement has not even the semblance of probability. The weight of evidence is quite in favour of the conclusion that very few fully conformed. The two most noted conformists were Curwin, Archbishop of Dublin, and O'Fihel or Field, Bishop of Leighlin.[3] These two prelates were comparatively safe in their compliance; for Curwin was protected by the garrison of Dublin; and the See of Leighlin was in the principality of the Earl of Ormond—almost the only Protestant nobleman in Ireland.[4] But Leverous of Kildare and Walsh of Meath, both of whom were within the Pale, peremptorily refused to change their faith. Leverous, who had been known long before as a dangerous conspirator in the

---

[1] See before, p. 364, *note* (3).

[2] Mant, i. 278; Wordsworth's *History of the Church of Ireland*, p. 209. London, 1869.

[3] Brady's *Irish Reformation*, p. 174. It is even somewhat doubtful whether Field persevered in his allegiance to Protestantism. See Brady, 104-5; and Moran's *Archbishops of Dublin*, p. 184. Dublin, 1864. Mr. Froude maintains that only Curwin and Field "*can be proved* to have conformed." Roman Catholic writers are willing to add Alexander Devereux, Bishop of Ferns, to the conformists. See Kelly's *Dissertations*, p. 365. This Devereux was a most worthless character. Brady's *Irish Reformation*, p. 102.

[4] See Mr. Froude's letter in Brady's *Irish Reformation*, p. 174.

Papal interest,[1] was instantly deprived of his bishopric.[2] Walsh, who appears to have been the leader of the episcopal opposition, was set aside a few months afterwards.[3] In the beginning of the reign of Mary he had supplanted Staples as Bishop of Meath: and now, in his turn, he experienced another of the vicissitudes of this unsettled century. Thonery, Bishop of Ossory, was deprived in 1561.[4] Lacy of Limerick, in consequence of his nonconformity, appears to have been marked out for deprivation as early as 1562:[5] but government required his political services; and, though he persisted in his adherence to the Romish ritual, he retained his See till 1571.[6] Redmund O'Gallagher, Bishop of Killala, who was afterwards translated to Derry by the Pope, lived and died a Romanist.[7] Bodkin, Archbishop of Tuam, took the oath of allegiance; but there is no evidence that he ever disowned the Papal supremacy; he was the confidant of David Wolf, the Papal nuncio; and, notwithstanding the Act of Uni-

---

[1] See before, p. 348, *note* (1).

[2] He was deprived in January 1560 for refusing to take the oath of supremacy. He acted as Papal Bishop till he died, aged 80, in 1577. He was buried at Naas. Brady's *Irish Reformation*, p. 94. He was for some time in prison.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 61. He was at length banished, and died in 1577 in Spain. Brenan, p. 406. He was more than once imprisoned.

[4] It is admitted on all hands that Thonery was deprived for non-conformity, so that the groundlessness of the statement, as to the compliance of all but two of the Marian Bishops, is apparent. See Dr. A. T. Lee's *Irish Epis. Suc.*, p. 55; Brady's *Irish Refor.*, pp. 99, 100; Shirley, pp. 101, 206.

[5] Brady's *Irish Reformation*, p. 139.

[6] Lee's *Irish Epis. Succession*, p. 55; Brady's *Irish Reformation*, p. 140. He never conformed. See Kelly's *Dissertations on Irish Church History*, pp. 318, 364, 438. He is said to have died in prison in 1580. *Ibid.*

[7] According to Dr. Lee (*Irish Epis. Suc.*, pp. 57-58) there is "*no proof whatever*" that O'Gallagher *continued* a Roman Catholic, save *the assertion* "that he was translated by the Pope to Derry in 1569." Dr. Brady (in his *Irish Reformation*, fifth edition, p. 82) has set this matter at rest; for he has there furnished an amount of documentary evidence, far more than sufficient to satisfy any candid inquirer. Nor has he thus nearly exhausted the testimony which may be produced. O'Gallagher, who was killed in O'Kane's country in 1601, is ranked among the Romish martyrs. At the time of his death he is said to have been "the senior Bishop in Europe."—Kelly's *Dissert.*, p. 372. In 1597 we find him in connection with O'Boyle, R.C. Bishop of Raphoe, settling a dispute between the friars of Donegal and the monks of Assaroe.—O'Donovan's *Four Masters*, A.D. 1597. See also King's *Primer*, p. 1213, and a subsequent note in this volume.

formity, he continued to celebrate mass in his cathedral.[1] Art O'Gallagher, who was Bishop of Raphoe at the time of Elizabeth's accession, has been described as "a spirited gentleman" who "always went with a troop of horsemen under his colours."[2] He appears to have stood in very little awe of the Queen's Government; and he was not forthcoming in the Parliament of 1560. He died in 1561; and his successor Donald McGonnigle, (or Mac Comghail) was so far from conforming to Protestantism, that he attended the Council of Trent.[3] The See of Ross was vacant when Elizabeth was advanced to the throne; and Maurice O'Hea, the next Bishop—who was appointed by the Pope—died not long after his consecration. In December 1561 Thomas O'Herlihy was nominated his successor by the court of Rome; and he, as well as McGonnigle, sat in the Council of Trent.[4] Another Irish member of that Council was Eugene O'Harte, Bishop of Achonry. He was appointed to his office by the Pope in January 1562. His uncle, Cormac O'Coyne, or Quin,—who presided over the diocese at the time of Elizabeth's accession—died in full communion with the Church of Rome in the year 1561.[5] Bernard O'Higgins, Bishop of Elphin, resigned his office in 1561; and died, two years afterwards, in a monastery in Portugal.[6] Roger Skiddy, Bishop-elect of Cork and Cloyne when Elizabeth reached the

---

[1] Brady's *Irish Reformation*, p. 151; Kelly's *Dissertations*, p. 417. Archdeacon Stopford states that Bodkin of Tuam and another prelate "are links in the Anglican succession, against a papal succession—all the more forcible *because they held Popish doctrine!*"—*The Unity of the Anglican Church.* An answer to Brady. p. 52. Dublin, 1867.

[2] Brady's *Irish Reformation*, p. 84. Mant, notwithstanding his assertion as to the conformity of all the Irish Bishops except two, admits elsewhere that the See of Raphoe was filled by Romanists until 1605.—*Hist. of Church of Ireland*, i. 737.

[3] His name, with those of two Irish Bishops afterwards mentioned, may be found appended to the Canons and Decrees of the Council.

[4] In 1571 O'Herlihy was captured and imprisoned for upwards of three years and a half in the Tower of London. He died in 1579 or 1580. Brady's *Irish Ref.*, p. 137; Kelly's *Dissertations*, p. 443.

[5] Brady's *Irish Reform.*, pp. 158-9. Moran's *Archbishops of Dublin*, p. 181. Mant names Miler Magrath as the first Protestant Bishop of Achonry. *Hist. of Church of Ireland*, i. 742.

[6] Brady's *Irish Reformation*, p. 161. Kelly's *Dissertations*, p. 428.

throne, was not inducted until nearly four years afterwards: and, when at length consecrated in 1562, the ceremony was performed after the Romish fashion.[1] Though he thus contrived to satisfy his conscience on his admission to the bishopric, he was a Roman Catholic at heart; and, as he felt himself uncomfortable in such a very equivocal position, he eventually resigned his dignity in the spring of 1567.[2] Patrick Walsh, who was Bishop of Waterford from 1558 to 1578, ignored the Act of Uniformity, sanctioned the worship of images and the celebration of the mass, and to the day of his death permitted the rankest popery to be publicly preached in his cathedral.[3] Raymond MacMahon, Bishop of Clogher, certainly never conformed to Protestantism; for he died at Rome in 1560.[4] Peter Wall, or Wale, who was Bishop of Clonmacnoise, at the time of this ecclesiastical revolution, died in communion with the Pope.[5] Raymund De Burgh, Bishop of Emly, who was a Franciscan monk, died in 1562; and was buried by his brethren in the monastery of Adare:[6] and James Fitzmaurice, Bishop of Ardfert, remained till his death a noted and zealous Romanist. He joined in 1579 in an attempt to overturn the government; and he was, in consequence, attainted and deprived of his property.[7]

These facts abundantly disprove the statement that, in the

---

[1] Brady's *Irish Reform.*, pp. 130-1. *Carew MSS*, 1589-1600. Introd. xlv.

[2] Brady's *Irish Reform.*, p. 131. The Hon. and Rev. Mr. Percival, in his *Apology for the Doctrine of Apostolical Succession*, states that, at the accession of Elizabeth, two of the Irish Bishops resigned "on account of their adherence to the supremacy of the See of Rome." Bishop Mant appears to think that Lacy of Limerick and Skiddy of Cork and Cloyne, are the two thus indicated.—*History of the Church of Ireland*, p. 747. But he is here obviously mistaken. Lacy was deprived. See before, p. 380, and *note* (6). The reference obviously is, not to Skiddy and Lacy, but to Skiddy and O'Higgins.

[3] Brady's *English State Church in Ireland*, pp. 69-76. London, 1869.

[4] Brady's *Irish Reform.*, pp. 53-54.

[5] *Ibid.* pp. 66-67. Moran's *Archbishops of Dublin*, p. 183.

[6] Brady's *Irish Reform.*, p. 125; Kelly's *Dissertations*, p. 429. Mant ranks him among the Protestant prelates, evidently without any authority.—*Hist. of Church of Ireland*, i. 739.

[7] Brady's *Irish Reform.*, p. 142; Kelly's *Dissertations*, p. 311. As to other Irish bishops who were Romanists see Kelly's *Dissertations*, pp. 428, 436, 439; Moran's *Archbishops of Dublin*, pp. 183, 187, 188; and Brady's *Irish Reformation*, pp. 71, 75, 79, 82, 144, 148.

beginning of the reign of Elizabeth, nearly all the Marian Bishops passed over to the side of Protestantism.[1] Four of them were deprived; two resigned; and a large number besides never exhibited any inclination to embrace the reformed faith. Those who made the transition must have been far in the minority;[2] and not one of them seems to have acted purely from conviction. We cannot point even to one who was afterwards known as an able and earnest Christian Minister. It is remarkable that, of the twenty-five or twenty-six Bishops who were in office, about the time when Elizabeth commenced her reign, all were of Irish birth except Curwin; and that not one of them, except Curwin, can be proved to have joined in the consecration of a Bishop appointed by Elizabeth.[3] It is no doubt very probable that the Archbishop of Dublin had assistants:[4] but it is somewhat extraordinary that the name of Curwin, and of Curwin alone, appears in the consecration records of the prelates nominated by the Queen during the first eight years of her government.[5]

---

[1] Dr. Brady has shown, upon evidence more or less conclusive, that *twenty-one* bishops did not conform.—*Irish Reform.*, p. 166. It has been urged that, as all the clergy were bound to take the oath of supremacy, therefore all who held office after the passing of the Act enforcing it must have conformed. But there is no weight in this argument. The Queen, in most parts of the country, could not enforce the oath. In an Act of the Irish Parliament, passed in 1571, it is stated that the Dean and Chapter of Armagh Cathedral were, with some few exceptions, "Irishly affectioned and small hope of their conformities." The Archbishop was, in consequence, authorized to act without them. See Irish Statutes, 13th year of Elizabeth, chap. iv.

[2] Bramhall intimates (*Works, Ang. Cath. Lib.*, vol. ii., p. 52; vol. iii., p. 47) that *seven* Irish prelates conformed; but he adds significantly that they held their places "*until they had made away to their kindred all the land belonging to their Sees.*" Such men cannot be reckoned Protestants: they were simply swindlers.

[3] Brady's *Irish Reform.*, pp. 189, 197. Archdeacon Stopford states that "the record of the names of the consecrators with Curwin, of Craike, Loftus, and Brady, *is lost.*"—*The Unity of the Anglican Church*, p. 80.

[4] I must say that Dr. Brady here displays rather unreasonable scepticism. Curwin could, no doubt, have easily found assistants. In such a case some of the Bishops, who were papists at heart, would not have been very scrupulous.

[5] Brady's *Irish Reformation*, p. 188. Dr. Brady has remarked that so far as the Act (2nd of Eliz., chap. 4) is concerned, "the archbishop, who is ordered to consecrate a bishop, may consecrate *either singly* or with the assistance of English bishops who need not be Irish."—*Ibid.* p. 185. This writer has been at wonderful pains to illustrate the episcopal succession in the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, and

The folly of resting the authority of the Christian ministry on any supposed episcopal succession is more than once clearly illustrated in the history of the Church of Ireland. At this critical period there is a strange dearth of satisfactory records; and, in the absence of distinct proof, it is scarcely safe to presume that all things were done, "decently and in order;" for the episcopal bench was now occupied by worldlings who, in all likelihood, were not very scrupulous as to the observance of canon law. And has the ministry lost its authority if such a man as Curwin acted irregularly in the matter of consecrations? Surely not. The true title deeds of the ministers of the Gospel are described, not in diocesan registries, but in the imperishable Word of God: and the Great Teacher instructed his people how to judge of their credentials when he said "ye shall know them *by their fruits*."[1] The episcopal succession cannot be a safe directory; for, in the case before us, it presents to us two hierarchical chains of a completely different character, both of which may be traced up to the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth. The Romish, as well as the Anglican Church, has maintained to this day a line of prelates in Ireland.[2] If the Marian Bishops possessed what has been called the apostolical succession, those of them who remained in communion with the church of Rome, could transmit it to their successors in as much purity as those who, merely for the sake of preserving their emoluments, consented to conform. Walsh of Meath, who submitted to deprivation rather than act in opposition to the dictates of his conscience, is entitled to at least as much respect as Curwin of Dublin, who veered about with every change of Government. If this episcopal succession be a divine heritage, it can surely be handed down as safely by an honest man as by a time-server. But the New Testament

evidently regards it as a matter of supreme importance. He has himself, it appears, passed over since into the communion of Rome—apparently deluded by the doctrine of apostolical succession—a doctrine which leads, not to Christ, but to "endless genealogies, which minister questions, rather than godly edifying."

[1] Mat. vii. 16.

[2] The succession of the Romish Bishops may be found in Brady's *Irish Reformation*. Bishop Mant has given the Protestant Episcopal succession in his *History of the Church of Ireland*.

ignores this apocryphal token of apostleship. The presence of Christ is secured by promise only to those ministers who walk in the way of His testimonies. "Go," said He to His heralds, "and *teach* all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, *teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you:* and lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world."[1] If the Apostle Paul himself had preached "another Gospel," he would have forfeited his commission.[2]

At this time the authority of the English Sovereign was very feeble beyond the Pale; and it is not therefore strange that so large a number of the bishops disregarded the act of uniformity. Neither can it be considered extraordinary that they persisted firmly in their adherence to Romanism. In the samples of Protestantism commonly presented to them, they could see no indications of its superior excellence. It came from a country which many of them detested: it was associated with tyranny and sycophancy: and, as it was propagated by a race of hirelings, it wanted even the odour of sanctity. Some of the Romish dignitaries were nominated, not by the Crown, but by the Irish chiefs[3]—acting, it may be, in conjunction with the cathedral clergy: the Pope himself almost always contrived to have a considerable share in their election: and we can thus discover an additional reason for their refusal to conform. But we are not to suppose that these prelates were noted for intelligence, consistency, or uprightness. A very competent witness who would, if he could with propriety, have sustained their reputation, has described

---

[1] Mat. xxviii. 19, 20.

[2] Gal. i. 8.

[3] In a treaty between the Lord Deputy and Calvart O'Donnel, the Lord of Tyrconnel, or Connalia, made in the eighth year of Elizabeth, the Irish chief agrees to concede to the Queen "the donation (appointment) of all bishops and other ecclesiastical persons in Connalia."—*Calendar of the Patent and Close Rolls of Chancery in Ireland*, vol. i., p. 496. Dublin, 1861. In 1563, Elizabeth offered to concede to Shane O'Neill the appointment of the Archbishop of Armagh, and thus virtually to consent to the nomination of a Papist. See Froude, *History of England*, viii. 48-49. In 1564 Terence Daniel, a Romanist, was made Primate: and Elizabeth at one time offered to confirm the appointment. Froude, viii. 54. 379.

them as "ignorant, and without the spirit of their profession."[1] Leverous of Kildare, the first Bishop deprived, was certainly not a man of very high character.[2] Walsh of Meath seems to have been in every way more respectable; and the firmness with which he submitted to suffering,[3] rather than compromise his principles, is entitled to all praise. Others of his brethren cannot claim the same commendation. Terence O'Brien, Bishop of Killaloe—one of the Marian prelates who stood out in opposition to Protestantism—was the father of a family of illegitimate children.[4] Christopher Bodkin, Archbishop of Tuam, contrived by occasional compliances, to retain the honours and emoluments of office till the end of his days. His friends apologised for his tergiversation by ascribing it to fear:[5] but it is impossible to respect a man who pursued such a course of hyprocrisy. Maurice Mac Gibbon, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Cashel, attempted in 1567 to assassinate his Protestant rival.[6] He appears to have been alike unprincipled and daring. He was deeply involved in the conspiracies of the reign of Elizabeth; but he offered to turn informer, on condition that Government would permit him to enjoy the metropolitan dignity.[7] James Fitzmaurice, Bishop of Ardfert, was, as we have seen, also implicated in rebellion. We cannot, indeed, fail to remark the wonderful contrast between the conduct of these Roman Catholic bishops and archbishops, and the example presented to them by the confessors and martyrs of the primitive ages. The ancient

---

[1] Kelly's *Dissertations on Irish Church History*, p. 370. Dublin, 1864. Dr. Kelly, the author of these dissertations, was professor of ecclesiastical history in Maynooth College. See before, p. 48, note (2).

[2] See before, p. 348, *note* (1). In the reign of Edward VI. he must have induced the Government to believe that he was favourable to Protestantism, as we find him recommended by Sir James Croft, the Irish Lord Deputy, for a bishopric. See Shirley's *Original Letters and Papers*, pp. 61-2.

[3] Walsh was first thrown into prison, and eventually sent into banishment. See before, p. 380, *note* (3). He is described by Loftus, Archbishop of Dublin, as "one of great credit amongst his countrymen, and upon whom, as touching causes of religion, they wholly depend.—Brady's *Irish Reformation*, p. 61.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 144. [5] *Ibid.* p. 150.

[6] *Calendar of Carew MSS.* 1589-1600. Introd. liv., *note.*

[7] Brady's *Irish Reformation*, pp. 111, 112.

worthies were men remarkable for their personal holiness: they delighted to preach Christ: they went about doing good: they eschewed sedition and treason, though living under pagan sovereigns. Many of the Romish prelates of the reign of Elizabeth are known to us, rather as restless intriguers, than as ministers of religion. They are not very scrupulous as to the means they employ for accomplishing their designs: they are often guilty of the grossest dissimulation and falsehood:[1] they are the chief agents in carrying on treasonable correspondence between the native chiefs and foreign governments: they are almost continually travelling between Ireland and the continent:[2] and, when the country is involved in the horrors of civil war, they appear among the belligerents, and perish on the battle field.[3] Such pastors cannot, assuredly, be "known and read of all men" as the commissioned heralds of the Prince of Peace.

The accession of Elizabeth to the crown and the change in the established worship did not deter Irishmen from undertaking journeys to Rome in quest of spiritual promotion in their native country. We read of no less than fourteen[4] of these Hibernians who, in the autumn of 1561, started for the metropolis of Italy, in the hope of obtaining advancement to the vacant Bishopric of Raphoe.[5] This resort to the head-

---

[1] Thus Eugene or Owen O'Harte, R.C. Bishop of Achonry, with a view to deceive the Protestant Primate, professes "to acknowledge his blindness," and to be "persuaded that the Man of Sin sitteth at Rome under pretence of the seat of God."—BRADY'S *State Papers Concerning the Irish Church*, p. 97. See also *Irish Reform.*, pp. 154-155.

[2] In 1583, we find no less than three of them together in Portugal.—Brady's *State Papers*, p. 67.

[3] In 1593 the R.C. Archbishop of Armagh was slain in battle. Mant, i. 285. In 1600 Oviedo, R.C. Archbishop of Dublin, during Tyrone's rebellion, "shared the perils of the Irish campaign."—MORAN'S *Archbishops of Dublin*, p. 208.

[4] See the letter of David Wolf, dated 12th October, 1561, in Moran's *Archbishops of Dublin*, p. 87.

[5] There was no Protestant bishop in Raphoe until the beginning of the reign of James I. Meanwhile Romish bishops enjoyed the temporalities. The Bishop of Raphoe, who was at the Council of Trent, "commonly accompanied O'Donnel (the chieftain of Tyrconnel) when he came to Dublin before the state; he dealt much for the business of the Church, and at length obtained letters under my Lord Deputy, Sir Henry Sidney, and the Council's hands for the immunity of his Church, that neither English nor Irish should have cess or press upon the Church

quarters of the Papacy appears to have continued throughout the whole of the reign of Elizabeth, if not later; and a contemporary, who was himself eventually Roman Catholic Archbishop of Armagh,[1] has described in no very complimentary terms the proceedings of the adventurers. "From the less civilized parts of Ireland," says he, "went forth persons, and some of them priests forsooth,[2] who had no learning or manners, and whose rude conduct was such as to render them offensive to those of superior education with whom they happened to have intercourse. These persons, unfortunately for their country, went straight to Rome, but not to acquire knowledge or good breeding; and as they arrived there with feet, and it is also to be feared with hands, and even head unwashed, betook themselves to seeking titles to benefices. . . . And not content with benefices, they spread their nets to catch the chief dignities in Ireland, even the very bishoprics. When success, in some instances, gratified their desires, they either neglected, after they were consecrated bishops, to fulfil their promise of returning to Ireland, or perhaps they merely paid it a visit, and then left it through fear or pretence of persecution. Then, wandering through various countries, or lingering idly in Spain, they turned all their attention to soliciting pensions to enable them to live there suitably to the dignity of their order."[3]

---

lands, and if any manner of person should offend contrary to the Lord Deputy and Council's order established in that behalf, that such delinquent shall pay unto the Church tenfold as much as should be thus wrongfully exacted."—COTTON'S *Fasti*, v. 262.

[1] Peter Lombard was of respectable parentage. He was appointed by the Pope Archbishop of Armagh in July 1601; but he never afterwards visited his native land. He died in Rome in 1625. His chief work, his *Commentarius*, was written in 1600, before his appointment to the Irish Primacy.

[2] The Pope at this time had no invincible unwillingness to bestow Irish benefices on laymen. Kelly describes those who filled the Sees and Rectories in 1560 as "men who in general were elected by family influence or by open violence and who not unfrequently *did not even take orders*, but after securing possession, retained the revenues for themselves, leaving the duties to be borne by poor and illiterate vicars."—*Dissertations*, p. 370.

[3] *De Regno Hiberniae, Sanctorum insula, Commentarius*, cap. xxi., p. 128. Dublin, 1868. There is a similar passage in Stanihurst. *De Rebus in Hibernia gestis*, lib. i., p. 6. See also *Columbanus ad Hibernos*, No. 2, p. xviii.

The critical position of Romanism in Ireland at the time of Elizabeth's accession did not escape the watchful eye of the Jesuits. A member of the fraternity, named Codure, had, as already stated,[1] been instructed to come here immediately after the order obtained the sanction of the Pope; and, ever since, one or other of its most active agents appears to have resided in the country. In the autumn of 1560 a Jesuit, invested with higher authority than any of his predecessors, arrived from Rome. He was a native of Limerick; his name was David Wolf; and he is said to have spent seven years in the ecclesiastical capital of the Latin Church "imbibing the full spirit of his order."[2] When he reached his destination he was known generally as *the Nuncio*—though perhaps his exact title was that of Apostolic Commissary. He was specially instructed to lay hold, if possible, on the education of the people; to supply tuition gratuitously; to establish schools of a superior class; to assist the clergy in receiving confessions, in administering the Eucharist, and in preaching; to see that the bishops resided in their dioceses; and to stimulate them to activity in the discharge of their various duties. But his first care was to visit the Irish chieftains, "to commend their unflinching constancy and zeal, and to encourage them to persevere in the defence of the Catholic faith."[3]

Wolf failed fully to carry out these instructions: for he was to a great extent prevented, partly perhaps by the state of the country, and partly by the vigilance of government, from organizing schools; but, withal, he rendered important service to the cause which he represented. His presence was soon felt in every part of the island. The wandering Irish worthies, who repaired to Rome to solicit rectories and bishoprics, were immediately confronted by his influence—as he recommended for promotion the candidates most likely to promote the Papal interests. He at once placed himself in communication with the native dynasts, and did not fail to foster their disloyalty. He exerted himself with wonderful

---

[1] See before, p. 351, *note* (2).

[2] Moran's *Archbishops of Dublin*, p. 77. Shirley's *Original Letters*, p. 171.

[3] Moran's *Archbishops of Dublin*, p. 78.

zeal and resolution ; and his career supplies a clear illustration of the fact that a man, ignorant of the true spirit of the Gospel, may be willing, in the service of what he calls religion, to give his body to be burned.[1] Though the Viceroy and other high officials were fully aware of his residence in Ireland and of his treasonable designs,[2] he contrived for years to elude capture. He was at length apprehended and subjected to a tedious imprisonment. He had meanwhile stirred up the zeal of the Romanists, improved their discipline, and whetted their bigotry: but his mission was otherwise a failure. Jesuitism, with much of the profession of religion, is nothing more than a dangerous development of priestcraft, largely impregnated with fanaticism ; and it cannot expect the favour of heaven. The Society of Ignatius Loyola was planned with consummate skill, and it has not wanted leaders of eminent learning and ability ; but its history is a forbidding commentary on its genius and character. It is associated with some of the darkest deeds perpetrated in Europe since the time of the Reformation. Ireland has had bitter experience of its tendency—for its fruits here have been perfidy, sedition, and misery. David Wolf, though not an unfavourable specimen of a Jesuit, is not a model for a good man to imitate. He spent his life in intrigue ; his reputation for integrity has been very gravely impeached :[3] and he seems to have died in exile, after having been implicated in more than one unsuccessful rebellion.[4]

Whilst the court of Rome was taking steps to sustain its interests in Ireland, the Protestant hierarchy was in a very unsatisfactory condition. Curwin, Archbishop of Dublin, styled "a complier in all reigns," has been already noticed ; his profanity, even on public occasions, exposed him to much

[1] 1 Cor. xiii. 3.

[2] In 1561 we find Elizabeth complaining that he had been sent into Ireland "to excite there disaffection against her crown."—Moran's *Archbishops of Dublin*, p. 78.

[3] A contemporary, apparently of good credit, speaks of him as the man "*that foreswore himself.*"—Moran's *Archbishops of Dublin*, p. 81, *note*.

[4] He appears to have died in Portugal in 1578. Moran's *Archbishops of Dublin*, p. 81.

censure;[1] and, in other respects, his example was not edifying. Craike—the first of the Reformation bishops consecrated after the accession of Elizabeth, and selected to supply the place of Leverous in Kildare—was a very unworthy type of a Protestant churchman. He resided generally in Dublin; he was seldom in his diocese; he could not preach in Irish;[2] he was noted for his inordinate covetousness; and he was eventually thrown into the Marshalsea because of the non-payment of the sums due for his first-fruits.[3] He died in the early part of 1564—so that he occupied the episcopal bench not much more than three years; and yet, in so short a period, he fraudulently exchanged all the manors and lands of his bishopric for some tithes of little value; and in this way did more mischief to his See than his successors were ever able to repair.[4] Hugh Brady—appointed to Meath in place of Walsh, the deprived Bishop—was a man of a very different character. He was born at Dunboyne, and was the younger son of one of the chieftains of Clare. His first wife was related to Sir William Cecil; and he was indebted for his promotion to that able and influential statesman. Brady has been described by an Irish Viceroy who was well acquainted with him, and who was an excellent judge of character, as "honest, zealous, and learned," and as "a godly minister of the Gospel."[5] He held the bishopric upwards of nineteen years; but during that time the Government so often required his services, in the management of its political concerns, that he must have found it totally impossible to bestow due attention on the spiritual

---

[1] He used "to swear terribly in open judgment."—BRADY'S *Irish Reformation*, p. 88.

[2] We find him writing to Lord Dudley stating that "he could not preach to the people, nor could the people understand him."—*Calendar of Patent and Close Rolls of Chancery in Ireland*, by Morrin, vol. i., p. 435, *note*. Robert Daly, who succeeded him in 1564, and who held the See eighteen years, could preach in Irish.—Cotton's *Fasti*, ii. 231. In the winter of 1582, Daly, who had twice before been plundered and ill-treated by the rebels, was driven out of his house, stripped naked, and so abused that he died. Ware's *Annals*, A.D. 1582.

[3] Brady's *Irish Reformation*, p. 98.

[4] Mant, i. 279.

[5] See Sir Henry Sidney's letter to Elizabeth, dated April 1576. *State Papers*, by Brady, p. 15. Brady, known in connection with Tate by the version of the Psalms so long in use in the Episcopal Church, was his descendant.—Bennet's *History of Bandon*, pp. 175-7. Cork, 1862.

interests of his diocese. He was, of course, master of the native tongue, and was a diligent as well as an efficient preacher; the churches under his care enjoyed a better supervision than any others in the country; and, unlike many of his brethren, who enriched themselves at the expense of their benefices, he died in comparative poverty.[1]

The career of Brady presents in various aspects, a marked contrast to that of his metropolitan. Adam Loftus—at first Archbishop of Armagh, and then Archbishop of Dublin—was a man of undoubted ability; and from his position was able to wield a more powerful influence than any other prelate in Ireland. He was a member of a wealthy Yorkshire family: he received a superior education: and in early life was reputed a Puritan. When Elizabeth visited Cambridge about the commencement of her reign, her attention was attracted by his graceful bearing, as well as by the eloquence and acuteness he exhibited in an academic disputation which she honoured with her presence. He was, in consequence, selected as one of her chaplains; and soon afterwards he acted in the same capacity to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. He was now made Dean of St. Patrick's, Dublin; and in the beginning of March, 1563, was consecrated Archbishop of Armagh.[2] George Dowdall—the Primate restored in the reign of Queen Mary—died a few months before his royal mistress:[3] and the Pope then nominated Donat McTeige as his successor.[4] McTeige died towards the close of 1562; and, in the month of March following, Richard Creagh was appointed by the Court of Rome to take his place;[5] but, for upwards of four years after the death of Dowdall, the See remained without a Protestant Archbishop. Ulster was, meanwhile, in such a state of confusion that the Queen perhaps did not think it wise to advance anyone to what would have been little better than a titular dignity. When Loftus was made Primate, he

---

[1] See *State Papers Concerning the Irish Church*, by Brady, pp. 16, 81, 82, 88.

[2] In November 1562 we find permission given to him "to receive the rents of all the lands, spiritual and temporal, belonging to the archbishopric *until his consecration.*"—*Calendar of Patent and Close Rolls*, by Morrin, i. 473.

[3] Brenan, p. 428.

[4] Brady's *Irish Reformation*, pp. 35, 36.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 37.

was only eight and twenty years of age ;[1] there is no evidence that he was ever enthroned in his cathedral :[2] and, during the four years that he held the northern Archbishopric, he resided chiefly in Dublin.

On the removal of Curwin to Oxford in 1567, Loftus was transferred to the Archiepiscopal See of Leinster : and, for nearly thirty-eight years afterwards, he may be regarded as the ruling spirit of the Established Church of Ireland. His personal appearance was prepossessing, he was an accomplished elocutionist, and, by some, was much admired as a preacher. He excelled in the department of declamation and invective ; he was a bitter assailant of the Romanists ; and his attacks on them from the pulpit created much exasperation.[3] But he certainly displayed little of the true spirit of the Gospel, and he seems to have been sadly ignorant of the mystery of godliness. He was dictatorial and domineering, ambitious and covetous. Not content with the spoils of St. Patrick's[4] and the Archbishopric of Dublin, he continued to grasp at preferment after preferment[5] with unblushing rapacity. Even the Dean and Chapter of Christ Church were so wearied with his importunities that, in August, 1578,—when solicited for some new favour,—they yielded to his application only on condition that he would never again seek any fee-farm grant, or any advowson of any prebend or living, or any lease of any benefice. When his undertaking to that effect was about to be recorded in the chapter books, he would fain have retracted his engagement ; and he pleaded hard for liberty to make one additional request : but, despite his remonstrances, his promise was regularly registered.[6] No wonder that such a man amassed a large

[1] He had not, therefore, reached the canonical age.

[2] Brady's *Irish Reformation*, p. 43.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 45.

[4] Its possessions by long leases were granted to the Archbishop, his children, and kinsmen.—Mant, i. 311.

[5] Among the other offices held by him was that of Lord Chancellor of Ireland.

[6] Harris's *Ware*, i. 353. In 1594 Loftus appointed his nephew, though he was only a layman, Archdeacon of Glendaloch. The nephew seems to have been as covetous as the uncle. See Elrington's *Ussher*, p. 114, *note*.

amount of property, and established a family still to be found among the nobility of the realm.[1]

Throughout the greater part of the country, the Government had no sufficient means of enforcing either the Act of Uniformity or the Oath of Supremacy. Bishops, rectors, sheriffs, and magistrates, were generally opposed to the recent legislation—so that it was found expedient to proceed most cautiously with the ecclesiastical changes. In May, 1563, the Archbishop of Armagh, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the Archdeacon of Meath, were empowered to administer the Oath of Supremacy "to all ecclesiastical persons of whatsoever dignity or degree:"[2] but the duty seems to have been very languidly performed. In October, 1565, a similar commission was issued to Loftus, Brady, and certain additional members, who were required "to cause all Archbishops, Bishops, and other ecclesiastical officers or ministers to subscribe the oath;" but they were merely authorized to report recusants. "If any of the clergy," says the document, "peremptorily and obstinately refuse to take the oath, their refusal is to be certified into chancery without delay."[3] It is apparent from these directions that, several years after the legal establishment of Protestantism, persons of the highest dignity in the Church had not conformed, and that government still hesitated to enforce against them the penalties of recusancy. In the metropolis, the state officials might venture to carry out the laws; and we are told accordingly that in 1563 "the Lord Lieutenant set forth a proclamation against the meetings of the friars and Popish priests in Dublin. . . . Also a tax was laid on every housekeeper who omitted coming to church on Sundays, and it was collected exactly. . . . At first they went to mass in the morning, and to church in the afternoon; but, to prevent this, a roll of the housekeepers' names was called over by the church-wardens in every parish."[4] Elsewhere the law was a dead letter. There were districts in which, for another generation, mass continued to be celebrated as heretofore.

[1] The first Peer was the Right Honourable Adam Loftus, Lord Chancellor of Ireland in 1619.

[2] *Calendar of Patent and Close Rolls*, by Morrin, i. 479.

[3] *Ibid.* i. 489, 490.

[4] Ware's *Annals*, A.D. 1563.

There were, in fact, no ministers in many places to conduct any other service. So far from complying with the Oath of Supremacy, the Irish-speaking cities and towns, throughout the whole of Elizabeth's reign, retained the old Romish oath, and required it from those elected to the magistracy and other offices.[1]

Though the Book of Common Prayer was to be used in Ireland according to the Act of Uniformity, a Confession of Faith was still wanting—as the Thirty-nine Articles had obtained no legal sanction in Great Britain when the Parliament met in Dublin in the beginning of 1560. It was, however, soon found necessary to provide a creed for the Irish Church; and early in 1567,[2] what was called "A brief Declaration of certain principal Articles of Religion" was issued by the Viceroy, Sir Henry Sidney, and a board of ecclesiastical commissioners. These articles, which are twelve in number,[3] were to be read publicly by the clergy when inducted into office, and twice every year afterwards. They exhibit the leading doctrines of Christianity, recognize the royal supremacy, and protest against the Mass as a propitiatory sacrifice. For nearly half a century they continued to be the acknowledged creed of the Protestant establishment.

When Wolf was sent from Rome in 1560, he received private instructions from the Cardinal Protector of Ireland to pay special attention to four of the great Hibernian chieftains.[4] Of these, O'Neill in the North was the most formidable to the English Government. The Nuncio adhered faithfully to his orders, and encouraged this powerful dynast to maintain that attitude of hostility by which the whole of Ulster was for years kept in disturbance.[5] Shane O'Neill, or as

---

[1] Peter Lombard, *De Regno Hiberniae*, cap. xx. p. 124.

[2] It is dated 20th January, 1566, that is, 1567, according to our reckoning.

[3] They were not long since brought to light by Dr. Elrington, in his *Life of Ussher*, appendix, iii. They are the same as were adopted in England in the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth. See Collier's *Ecc. Hist. of Great Britain*, vol. vi., p. 309. They possess a special interest as forming the earliest creed of the Protestant Church in Ireland, and they have therefore been appended to this volume. See appendix, i.

[4] Moran's *Archbishops of Dublin*, p. 78.

[5] In rch 1565, Creagh, the R.C. Primate of Armagh, admitted on his exami-

he has been sometimes designated John the Proud, is described by many writers as an earnest Romanist.[1] His prejudices were no doubt all in favour of the old ritual; and he is said to have applied to the Pope, as well as to the King of Spain, for aid in his struggles against Elizabeth;[2] but he was a most miserable representative of any form of Christianity. He possessed much activity and energy, great boldness, ingenuity, and diplomatic skill; and he did not want address, military talent, and rude eloquence; but he was thoroughly unprincipled and brutishly sensual. His ambition was to be King of Ulster, if not King of Ireland; and for this grand object he was willing to sacrifice everything besides. In 1567 he was killed at Cushendun, in a drunken carousal, by the Mac Donnels. Two years afterwards the Irish Parliament passed an Act for the attainder of himself and his associates in rebellion;[3] and thus more than half of Ulster was vested in the Queen, to be disposed of as might be deemed most conducive to the stability of her Government.

---

nation in London, that the Nuncio had been the summer before with Shane O'Neill in Ulster.—Shirley's *Original Letters*, p. 173.

[1] Thus Macgeoghegan (*Hist. of Ireland*, p. 461) speaks of him as "the support of Catholicity."

[2] Leland, ii. 234.

[3] The 11th of Elizabeth, Sess. 3, chap. i.

CHAPTER IV.

FROM THE DEATH OF SHANE O'NEILL TO THE DEATH OF THE EARL OF DESMOND. A.D. 1567 TO 1583.

AT the beginning of the sixteenth century Ireland had sunk lower in the scale of crime than perhaps any other country in Europe. An Irishman and a devout Romanist, writing in 1515, gives a most melancholy account of its moral condition. "There is," says he, "no land in this world of so long-continual war within itself, nor of so great shedding of Christian blood, nor of so great robbing, spoiling, preying, and burning, nor of so great wrongful extortion continually, as Ireland."[1] As the century advances we can recognize few indications of improvement. Sir Henry Sidney—who was Lord Deputy when Shane O'Neill was killed, and who was one of the best and wisest statesmen of his age—has left behind him a harrowing description of the state of the island at that period. "As touching the estate of the whole country," says he, in a letter to Elizabeth, "for so much as I saw of it, having travelled from Youghall to Cork, from Cork to Kinsale, and from thence to the uttermost bounds of it towards Limerick, like as I never was in a more pleasant country in all my life, so never saw I a more waste and desolate land—no, not in the confines of other countries where actual war hath continually been kept by the greatest princes in Christendom; and there heard I such lamentable cries and doleful complaints made by that small remain of poor people which yet are left, who (hardly escaping the

[1] *Carew MSS.*, 1575-1588. Introd. xvi.

fury of the sword and fire of their outrageous neighbours, or the famine which the same, or their extortious lords, hath driven them into, either by taking their goods from them or by spending the same, by their extort taking of coyne and livery) made demonstration of the miserable estate of that country. Besides this, such horrible and lamentable spectacles there are to behold as the burning of villages, the ruin of churches, the wasting of such as have been good towns and castles—yea, the view of the bones and skulls of your dead subjects, who, partly by murder, partly by famine, have died in the fields, as in troth hardly any Christian with dry eyes could behold. . . . Surely there was never a people that lived in more misery than they do, nor as it should seem of worse minds, for matrimony amongst them is no more regarded in effect than conjunction between unreasonable beasts ; perjury, robbery, and murder, counted allowable. Finally, I cannot find that they make any conscience of sin, and doubtless I doubt whether they christen their children or no, for neither find I a place where it should be done, nor any person able to instruct them in the rules of a Christian, or if they were taught I see no grace in them to follow it ; and when they die, I cannot see they make any account of the world to come."[1]

The state of Ireland at this time proves conclusively that the true unity of the Church does not consist in the recognition of one ecclesiastical ruler. For upwards of thirty years at the beginning of the sixteenth century the whole country acknowledged the Pope, and yet meanwhile the people were living "in malice and envy, hateful and hating one another;" and the sword scarcely ever rested in its scabbard.[2] For generations the business of religious instruction had devolved almost entirely on the begging friars. The multitude flocked to their services, because they preached, as well as celebrated

---

[1] Sir Henry Sidney to Elizabeth, April 20th, 1567. *Carew MSS.*, 1589-1600. Introd. lviii. lix.

[2] Mr. Richey has remarked that, though the *Annals of the Four Masters* pass by without notice many of the transactions in Leinster and Munster, yet, from 1500 to 1534, they record no less than 116 battles and depredations, *not reckoning the wars in which the English Government was engaged. Lectures*, Second series, p. 11.

mass. Their discourses were not, however, fitted either to sanctify or civilize. "The law of the Lord is perfect converting the soul,"[1] and wherever it is promulgated it exerts a holy and happy influence. But the friars taught "for doctrines the commandments of men," and their sermons only nourished superstition. In the beginning of the sixteenth century a large portion of the property of the Irish Church—including advowsons and tithes—belonged to the monasteries.[2] In all but the poorest parishes the ordinary service on the Lord's Day was performed by a vicar, appointed by one or other of these ecclesiastical corporations, and miserably remunerated. As the people preferred the ministrations of the monks, the cathedrals and churches in which the secular clergy officiated were often permitted to become dilapidated.[3] But at the Reformation—when the lands belonging to the monasteries were distributed among the nobility and gentry—the poor vicars were continued; for the new lords of the soil were bound by their title-deeds to provide for the celebration of divine worship; and they endeavoured, in the most economical manner, to fulfil the stipulation. If, as often happened, the bishop neglected the care of his diocese, and if the vicar and the new landlord acted in collusion, "they contrived between them to dismantle the church of its lead, its windows, its stonework, and all that was valuable. In a few years, church, vicar, and congregation, all disappeared; and the small tithes, equally as the great tithes, fell into the hands of the patron."[4] Thus it was that in the reign of Elizabeth so much ecclesiastical property was alienated, and that so many parish churches were in ruins. But the begging friars still prowled about the country, preached as before, denounced the change in religion, and fostered the discontent of the people."[5]

---

[1] Ps. xix. 7.

[2] *Calendar of Carew MSS.*, 1589-1600. Introd. xxxiv.

[3] See before, pp. 335-7.

[4] *Calendar of Carew MSS.*, 1589-1600. Introd. xxxv.

[5] In Burke's *Hibernia Dominicana*, p. 102, there is a Bull of Pope Pius V., issued in 1567, in which that Pontiff confirms certain privileges previously granted to the Irish Dominicans. This Bull supplies evidence that these friars were still influential in the country. Mr. Froude states that, at this time, half the so-called religious houses in Ulster, Connaught, and Munster, were still occupied by the friars.—*History of England*, xi. 191.

From a higher quarter attempts were now made to subvert the authority of Elizabeth. When she reached the throne, hopes had been entertained that she would disappoint the expectations of the Protestants, and lend her support to Romanism. Philip II. of Spain, the husband of bloody Mary, had sought her in marriage; and was quite sure of obtaining from the Pope a dispensation for the union. In May 1560, Pius IV. sent her a letter in which he addresses her as his "dearest daughter in Christ," promises her "any reasonable length of compliance which lies within the compass of his station," and employs other soothing arguments with a view to induce her to return to his communion.[1] But the Queen remained inflexible; and his successor, Pius V., lost patience, and in February 1570 issued against her a bull of excommunication.[2] In this blasphemous document he affirms that "He who reigns above, to whom all power in Heaven and in Earth is given, has consigned His one holy Catholic Church, out of which there is no salvation, to the sole government of St. Peter, the prince of the Apostles, and his successor, the Bishop of Rome. This successor he has constituted supreme over all nations and kingdoms, to root out and to pull down, to destroy, to build, and to plant." "Out of the plenitude of our apostolical authority," he continues, "we declare Elizabeth a heretic and an encourager of heretics, and that those who adhere to her lie under the censure of an anathema, and are cut off from the unity of the body of Christ. We likewise declare Elizabeth deprived of the pretended right to the kingdom, and of all dominion, dignity, and privilege whatsoever, and that all the nobility and subjects of the said realm who have sworn to her in any manner whatsoever are for ever absolved from any such oaths, and from all obligation of fidelity and allegiance. . . . We likewise command all the nobility, subjects, and others, that they

[1] This letter may be found in Collier, *Ecc. Hist. of Great Britain*, vi. 307-8. See also Dodd's *Church of England*, by Tierney, ii., appendix, cccxxi.

[2] This Bull may be found in Collier, *Ecc. Hist. of Great Britain*, vi. 471-474. See also King's *Primer*, supplementary vol., 1258-1262; Macgeoghegan's *Hist. of Ireland*, 463-4. Dublin, 1844; and Dodd's *Church History of England*, by Tierney, vol. iii., appendix, p. ii. London, 1840.

do not presume to obey her orders, commands, or laws for the future; and those who act otherwise are involved in the same sentence of excommunication."

The author of this bull had evidently no claim to be considered a successor of Peter. The apostle instructed his brethren to "honour the King," and to submit even to heathen governors;[1] but the Pontiff claims to be himself the prince of the Kings of the earth, asserts a right to depose sovereigns, and professes to be able to absolve from the guilt of perjury. Had his commands been now obeyed, England and Ireland would have been at once involved in the horrors of rebellion. Under terror of eternal perdition, every Romanist in these countries would forthwith have buckled on his armour, and attempted to hurl Elizabeth from the throne. But a bull so monstrous staggered the faith of many who could believe in transubstantiation. The Romanists had hitherto suffered little for their religion under a Protestant Queen; they were not generally prepared to peril property, liberty, and life at the bidding of this Italian high priest; and, notwithstanding the threat of excommunication, they remained quiescent. But not a few of them felt that they were placed in a false position—for they were shut up to the alternative of being either disobedient to the Head of their Church, or disloyal to their earthly sovereign. They were very unwilling to renounce their ancient worship; and yet they were equally unwilling to violate their oath of allegiance. The claims of the actual possessor of regal power proved stronger than theological scruples; and many Romanists, throughout the whole of this reign, remained faithful to the English Crown, despite all the papal fulminations.

There were others, however, who received the bull as if it had been a revelation from Heaven. Those who were under the influence of the Jesuits—including many of the more ignorant devotees of Romanism—did not hesitate to acknowledge that they were bound to obey the papal mandate. The friars openly proclaimed that Elizabeth had forfeited her right to the throne, and that she was to be detested and opposed as

[1] 1 Pet ii., 17, 14.

an excommunicated heretic. No administration, at all worthy of respect, could tolerate such defiance of its authority. Had Pius V. himself resided in the country when his bull appeared, he might have reckoned on ending his days by the hands of the common hangman. His dupes were entitled to expect no better treatment. They might plead that they suffered for religion, but common sense repudiates the apology. Any man, no matter what may be his creed, who attempts by unlawful means to overturn the existing government, stakes his life upon the issue; and, if unsuccessful, must be prepared to submit to the penalty of failure.

The bull of Pius was eagerly seized on by the enemies of English rule in Ireland for the purpose of adding to their adherents. James Fitzgerald, or as he was often called, James Fitzmaurice, who about this time was up in arms in Munster, appealed to it as a warrant for his rebellion.[1] But Romanists —who were not prepared for civil war—felt themselves compromised by this high-flown assertion of pontifical prerogative. Whilst it rendered them suspected as concealed traitors, it left them otherwise ill at ease; for, with this manifesto before them, they could not, as good subjects of the Pope, give any satisfactory reason why they continued to submit to the yoke of a royal heretic. Gregory XIII., who immediately succeeded Pius V., found it necessary to publish a Jesuitical explanation of the language of his predecessor. According to this edict, the present helplessness of his co-religionists in the British Isles justified their quiescence. The bull of Pius, he declared, "should always bind the Queen and the heretics, but it should by no means bind the Catholics, *as matters then stood or were;* only thereafter it should bind them *when the public execution of that bull may be had or made.*"[2]

Elizabeth was disposed to treat Romanists with indulgence so long as they remained faithful to their allegiance; and she instructed those entrusted with the administration of the law

---

[1] Ware's *Annals*, A.D. 1570; King's *Primer*, p. 777.

[2] Phelan's *Policy of the Church of Rome in Ireland.* Remains, ii. 181. See also Froude, chap. 28, *Reign of Elizabeth*, vol. v., p. 315. London, 1870; King's *Primer*, supplementary volume, 1325; and Dodd's *Church History of England*, by Tierney, iii. 13, *note.*

not to be over-zealous in insisting on their conformity.[1] She connived even in Dublin at the celebration of their worship; she permitted them to act as mayors, sheriffs, and magistrates; and she gave them military command. They formed a large portion of the soldiers employed in her Irish wars, as well as an influential section of the Irish Parliament. In the beginning of her reign many of them attended the parish churches as usual, though the fine of a shilling a day for absence from the service was seldom exacted.[2] But from the date of the appearance of the bull of excommunication, the line of demarcation between Protestants and Romanists became more distinct; and the zealous adherents of the Papal See were more unwilling to be present at the reformed worship. Still, the mass continued to be celebrated all over the country; and a priest who eschewed sedition had no reason to apprehend the slightest annoyance.

We have seen that in 1569 the Irish legislature sanctioned the attainder of Shane O'Neill. The same Parliament empowered government to take steps for dividing into counties all those parts of the island not yet so arranged.[3] It also provided for the establishment of a free school under an English master in each diocese of Ireland.[4] The bill embodying this proposal met with formidable opposition; and, though it passed into a law, no effective effort appears to have been made to carry its provisions into execution.[5] Sir Henry Sidney, the excellent Lord Deputy, had observed, with much concern, that

---

[1] Even at an advanced period of her reign the Queen was willing to dispense with the oath of supremacy within the Pale. See Froude, chap. 33, *Reign of Elizabeth*, vol. vi. p. 197.

[2] Peter Lombard, *De Regno Hiberniae*, chap. xx. p. 122. In March 1564 we find the Commissioners for ecclesiastical causes recommending the officials charged with executing "the laws for religion," that "*they meddle not* with *the simple multitude* now at the first, but with *one or two* boasting mass-men *in every shire*."—SHIRLEY'S *Letters*, p. 140. Only a small portion of the island was now shireland.

[3] Leland, ii. 244. "By virtue of the power vested in the Lord Deputy the district called Annally was reduced to an English county [the County of Longford]; and the province of Connaught divided into six, Clare (containing Thomond, now adjudged to belong to Connaught), Galway, Sligo, Leitrim, Mayo, and Roscommon."—*Ibid.* ii. 247.

[4] 12th of Eliz. chap. i.

[5] See *Report of Commissioners of Endowed Schools*. Dublin, 1858. p. 6.

the most important places in the church throughout Munster and Connaught were very unworthily occupied.[1] Persons "without lawfulness of birth, learning, English habit, or English language, descended of unchaste and unmarried abbots, priors, deans, and chaunters, and obtaining their dignities by force, simony, or other corrupt means," had been admitted to office.[2] Though nominally connected with the Protestant establishment, these men were really Papists: they celebrated the service in much the same way as in the days of Mary; and, with the whole population on their side, they could not well be called to account either for immorality, non-conformity, or ignorance. To put an end to this abuse an Act was now passed authorising the Viceroy, for ten years, to present to ecclesiastical dignities in these two provinces.[3]

Shortly after the meeting of this Parliament an attempt was made to enlighten the natives through the medium of their own language. Nicholas Walsh, Chancellor of St. Patrick's, Dublin, and John Kearney, treasurer of the same cathedral, are honourably distinguished in connection with this patriotic enterprise. They acted in co-operation, for they were attached friends; and they had formerly been fellow-students in the University of Cambridge. In 1571 they introduced Irish types into Dublin, and obtained an order

---

[1] The dilapidation of the churches, of which we read so much in the beginning of the reign of Henry VIII., still continued. The Irish Lord Chancellor, writing to Cecil (March 12th, 1570), says: "Churches and chapels are so universally down or decayed as though there were no God nor religion."

[2] According to Camden, who lived at this time, the Irish priests were now shamelessly immoral. "Their children," says he, "succeed them in their churches, for whose illegitimation they are dispensed with. . . . These priest's sons, that follow not their studies, prove for the most part notorious thieves. . . . As for the daughters of these priests, if their fathers be living, they are set forth with good portions in case they wed: but if their fathers be dead, either they beg or prostitute their bodies."—*Ireland*, pp. 144-145. *Britannia*, by Holland. London, 1610. Dr. Kelly, of Maynooth, says of Ireland in the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth: "*Never had there been such ignorance in the land.*"—*Dissertations on Irish Church History*, pp. 369-70.

[3] Leland, ii. 245; 11th of Elizabeth, chap. 6. There is a remarkable document in the *Journal of the Kilkenny Archæological Society* (New Series, vol. i., pp. 80-82), which shows that, in various places, and late in the reign of Elizabeth, bishops, though Roman Catholics, remained in the enjoyment of the Sees. See before, p. 387, *note* (5).

from Government for printing the prayers of the service book in the native tongue.[1] A church in the county-town of each diocese was to be set apart for the use of the Irish liturgy,[2] and for preaching in the vernacular language. But a supply of qualified preachers was not forthcoming, and as yet there was no provision for their education—so that the scheme well nigh proved abortive. So far as it was carried out, it is said to have been attended with singular success; and not a few, by this simple agency, appear to have been won over to Protestantism.[3] The Irish types and printing-press were furnished at the expense of Queen Elizabeth, in hope, as we are told, "that God in mercy would raise up some to translate the New Testament into their mother tongue for the people of the island."[4]

Twice in the sixteenth century the See of Ossory was more highly favoured than any other in the kingdom. During the closing months of the reign of Edward, and for a short time in the beginning of the reign of Mary, it enjoyed the ministry of the devoted Bale; and, four-and-twenty years afterwards, it had another bishop distinguished above his contemporaries by his spirit and attainments. In 1577 Nicholas Walsh—who had already signalized himself by his zeal for the spiritual instruction of his countrymen—was appointed to preside over the diocese. In conjunction with his friend Kearney he had, in 1573, commenced a translation of the New Testament from the original Greek into Irish; and, after his promotion to the See of Ossory, he continued to prosecute his task. He has

---

[1] King's *Primer*, p. 780. John Kearney composed an Irish *Catechism and Primer*, which was the first book printed in Ireland in the Irish language. Its title bears date 1571. See Anderson's *Sketches of the Native Irish*, p. 22, and *note*. Edinburgh, 1828.

[2] King's *Primer*, p. 780.

[3] Mant, i. 293.

[4] King's *Primer*, p. 780. It is said that these types, "owing to the cupidity of one party into whose possession they had come, were secured by the Jesuits, and by them carried over to Douay, for the express purpose of promoting their own views in Ireland through the medium of the Irish language."—ANDERSON'S *Sketches of the Native Irish*, p. 37. Edinburgh, 1828. The types were not removed from Ireland until after the time of Oliver Cromwell. See *Ecc. Hist. Society's Publications. Book of Common Prayer for Ireland*, vol. i. Introd. xii., *note*. London, 1849.

been described as "learned, pious, charitable, and studious;"[1] and his zeal for the translation of the Scriptures into the vernacular tongue shows that he understood the spiritual wants of Ireland. In preparing a version of the New Testament, Kearney and Walsh were assisted by Nehemia Donellan, a native of Galway, educated at Cambridge.[2] But Walsh held the Bishopric of Ossory for little more than eight years. Bale was driven from it by an infuriated rabble headed by a band of priests; and Walsh was mortally wounded by a wretch whom he had brought under discipline for adultery.[3] The translation of the New Testament into Irish, commenced by Walsh and his two coadjutors, was completed by William Daniel, or O'Donel,[4] and published in 1602.[5]

In the reign of Elizabeth such men as Walsh and Kearney were rare in Ireland.[6] Their labours present almost the only green spot to be discovered in the spiritual landscape. Elsewhere there is a land of darkness and of the shadow of death. In other countries the Reformation at once produced good

---

[1] Brady's *English State Church in Ireland*, p. 41. Ware, in his *Irish Writers*, states that Walsh is the author of "learned sermons in Latin yet extant in his own handwriting," p. 25.

[2] Donellan was made Archbishop of Tuam in 1595. He voluntarily resigned the See in 1609, and died shortly afterwards at Tuam.—Cotton's *Fasti*, iv., p. 13. In the writ directing his appointment, dated Greenwich, May 1595, it is stated that he "hath taken great pains in translating and putting to press the *Common* [Communion] *Book* and *New Testament* in the Irish language."—*Calendar of Patent and Close Rolls*, by Morrin, ii., p. 401. Daniel, who succeeded him as Archbishop, printed at his own expense the *Book of Common Prayer*, translated into Irish, with the exception of the Psalms.—King, ii. 781; Reid's *History of Presb. Church in Ireland*, i. 53, *note*. Belfast, 1867.

[3] Harris's *Ware*, i. 419.

[4] Daniel was made Archbishop of Tuam on the resignation of Donellan in 1609. He died in 1628.

[5] *Ecc. Hist. Soc. Publications. Book of Common Prayer for Ireland*, by Stephens, vol. i. Introd. xii, *note*, and xxix. Daniel was educated at Dublin College, and had obtained a Fellowship there. *Ibid.* cxlvii.

[6] Sir Henry Wallop, Lord Justice from 1582 to 1584, says of Walsh:—"He was the only man of his coat that ever I knew born in this country that did most sincerely know and teach the gospel."—*State Papers*, by Brady, p. 103. Walsh is said to have been the son of Patrick Walsh, Bishop of Waterford (Cotton's *Fasti*, v. 157); and if so, must have been illegitimate; and it has been remarked as a significant fact, that he could obtain no promotion in his father's diocese. See Brady's *English State Church in Ireland*, p. 70.

fruit. The preaching of Luther at Wittemberg awakened the deepest seriousness, and a marked improvement was speedily perceptible in the general character of the population. Zürich, in the time of Zwingle, was the scene of a revival; and multitudes were turned from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God. Geneva—which before had been noted for licentiousness—became, under the ministry of Calvin and his fellow-labourers, the most moral city in Europe.[1] The preaching of Knox in Scotland produced similar results. The reformed pastors of North Britain, in point of intelligence and piety, presented a striking contrast to the old Popish clergy. But it was otherwise in this country. The history of the Church in Ireland illustrates the folly of attempting to accomplish a religious reformation merely by Acts of Parliament. The people were not instructed, or permitted to have any share in the government of the ecclesiastical community; the patrons of livings were totally unfit to be entrusted with the nomination of pastors; and men alike immoral and incompetent were often thrust into benefices. In English districts, the more zealous priests deserted the churches, when no longer permitted to say mass within their walls; the people in a body attended worship celebrated elsewhere by their old guides; and the neglected ecclesiastical buildings soon became so ruinous as to be unfit for service. But in parts of the country remote from Dublin, the priests, in numberless cases, continued to officiate in the old buildings during the whole of the reign of Elizabeth.[2] Many of them, no doubt, would have been

[1] John Knox, writing from Geneva in 1556, says:—"This place . . . I neither fear nor eshame to say, is the most perfect School of Christ that ever was in earth since the days of the Apostles. In other places I confess Christ to be truly preached; but *manners and religion* to be so sincerely reformed, I have not yet seen in any other place besides."—McCRIE'S *Knox*, p. 120. Edinburgh, 1840.

[2] What is more—bishops, *who were well known to the Government as Romanists*, continued to enjoy the temporalities of their Sees at an advanced period of her reign. Thus, in 1576, we find Sir Henry Sidney saying:—"There came three or four Bishops of the provinces of Cashel and Thewnne [Tuam], which bishops, *albeit they were Papists*, submitted themselves unto the Queen's Majesty, and unto me her deputy, *acknowledging that they held all their temporal patrimony* of the Queen's Majesty, and desired humbly that they might by Her Highness be inducted into their ecclesiastical prelacy." These men were evidently already in possession of the temporalities; but they wished the Crown to sanction their anomalous position. See the

willing, as in the days of Henry VIII., to take the oath of supremacy, and to submit otherwise to the will of the State; but as there was no one to insist on their conformity, and as they could not well perform the new service, they were permitted, without challenge, to adhere to the Romish ritual.[1]

The disorganized condition of Ireland at this time placed very grave difficulties in the way of its religious improvement. Some political Protestants proposed to prosecute the work of evangelization after a rather stern fashion. In 1574 a man of high office in Dublin actually suggested to the Secretary of State in England that, when making appointments to the most exalted stations in the Irish Church, Her Majesty should specially consider the military capacity of the candidates. "Let *all* offices," said Sir Edward Waterhouse, "be given to soldiers of experience, and to none others. I would the Queen would also *so bestow her bishoprics*, for here is scarce any sign of religion, nor no room for justice, till the sword hath made a way for the law." When such views were entertained and avowed, it is not extraordinary that multitudes of the clergy were a scandal to their profession. Mere laymen—totally illiterate and of the lowest class in society—were found in possession of Church livings.[2] We read of sixteen benefices in the neighbourhood of Trim, in not one of which was there a minister who either understood Latin or could read English.[3]

"Memoir of Sidney" in the *Ulster Journal of Achæology*, vol. v., p. 312. See also before, p. 380, *note* (7); p. 387, *note* (5); and p. 404, *note* (3).

[1] Some Roman Catholic writers have most disingenuously quoted descriptions given of these men as if they were specimens of the early *Protestant* clergy, whereas they were really the priests who officiated before the Reformation, and who still kept their places. One of the greatest offenders in this way is Dr. Moran, who, in giving a quotation, *actually suppresses a clause in the middle of it*, which would have exposed the deception. See his *Archbishops of Dublin*, p. 165, as compared with the Act of Parliament, 11th of Eliz., chap. 6.

[2] *State Papers*, by Brady, p. 10. Sir Edward Waterhouse to Francis Walsingham, dated June 14th, 1574. Waterhouse was clerk of the Court of Star Chamber.

[3] Laymen held the bishoprics of Ross and Kilfenora. *State Papers*, by Brady, p. 30. See also Froude, chap. 27. Reign of Elizabeth, vol. v., p. 200. In 1581, the Queen complains "of the small number that could be found of persons of that (clerical) calling, able to teach, especially in the functions of a bishop."—*Calendar of Patent and Close Rolls of Chancery in Ireland*, by Morrin, vol. ii., p. 31.

[4] *State Papers*, by Brady, p. 37.

Boys nine or ten years of age, apprentices, common soldiers, and servants, were admitted to Church preferments.[1] In 1576 one hundred and five of the parish churches in the diocese of Meath—then the "best peopled" and "best governed" part of the country—are reported as mere ruins. Sir Henry Sidney states, in one of his letters to the Queen, that almost all these parishes were under the care of "very simple or sorry curates." Among this number, he adds, "only eighteen were found able to speak English, the rest *Irish priests*,[2] or rather Irish rogues, having very little Latin, less learning and civility. All these live upon the bare altar-ages, as they term them, which, God knoweth, are very small; and were wont to live upon *the gain of masses*, dirges, shrivings, and such like trumpery, godly abolished by your Majesty. . . . In many places the very walls of the churches down, very few chancels covered, windows or doors ruined or spoiled. There are fifty-two other parish churches more, in the same diocese [of Meath], which have vicars endowed upon them, better served and maintained than the other, yet but badly. There are fifty-two parish churches more . . . . which pertain to divers particular Lords, and these, though in better estate than the rest, commonly are yet far from well."[3] In 1580 Marmaduke Middleton, Bishop of Waterford and Lismore, reports to Walsingham that "most of the incumbents" of his diocese were "little better than woodkerne."[4] It was not to be expected that the Church could be in a healthy condition when even prelates were not ashamed to avow that they sold their ecclesiastical patronage. Matthew Sheyne, who was

---

[1] *Ibid.* p. 29, 33.

[2] Dr. Moran corrupts the text of this passage by substituting the word "ministers" for "priests." See his *Archbishops of Dublin*, p. 165. His object is to represent these men as specimens of Protestantism! He immediately afterwards, in the same way, suppresses what is said of "the gain of masses, dirges, shrivings, and such like trumpery."

[3] *State Papers*, by Brady, p. 16.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 41. In 1582 Middleton was translated to St. David's in Wales. He was afterwards deprived for forging a will. Brady's *Irish Reformation*, p. 129. When in Waterford he made wasteful leases of the See lands. Being both Bishop and Dean of Waterford, and having in his keeping the charter seal of Lismore, he could the more easily accomplish his dishonest purposes. Cotton's *Fasti*, i. 124.

Bishop of Cork from 1572 to 1582—when visited by certain ecclesiastical commissioners appointed by the Queen, and when charged by them with trading on the livings of his diocese, and disposing of them "to horsemen and kerne (foot soldiers)—answered both privately to them, and openly in a sermon made in the church of Cork before Sir William Drury, knight, Lord President of Munster,[1] and the said commissioners, and the whole audience then present, that except he sold the livings of his collation, he were not able to live, his bishopric was so poor." [2]

When we consider that too many like Sheyne occupied the high places of the Church, it is not difficult to understand how it was that Protestantism made so little progress in Ireland in the reign of Elizabeth. With rare exceptions, the bishops were mere worldlings;[3] some of them were utterly useless, and others abominably immoral. Christopher Gafney, who was Bishop of Ossory from 1567 to 1576, employed a Roman Catholic prelate to ordain his candidates for the ministry.[4] Richard Dixon, Bishop of Cloyne, was degraded for bigamy and adultery of a very aggravated character.[5] John Devereux, who was Bishop of Ferns from 1566 to 1578, was a person of almost equally infamous reputation.[6] Alexander Devereux, his immediate predecessor, was a dignitary of the same stamp.[7] In 1584 the prebendaries of St. Patrick's, Dublin, wrote to the Lords of the Council in England stating that only four, of all the bishops and archbishops in Ireland, would, or could preach.[8] But among the Irish churchmen of the reign of

---

[1] From 1576 to 1578.

[2] *State Papers*, by Brady, p. 31.

[3] Cox tells of Maurice O'Brien, Bishop of Killaloe, that in A.D. 1580, during the wars which preceded the fall of the Earl of Desmond, the "unconscionable" churchman "demanded thirty pounds (equal to about £320 of our money) for *one night's grazing* for an hundred and sixty horse."—*Hibernia Anglicana*, p. 366. This Maurice is said to have been second son of O'Brien, King of Thomond. He was appointed bishop on political grounds.

[4] *State Papers*, by Brady, pp. 29-32.

[5] Brady's *Irish Reformation*, p. 132. He remained in office only a year. Cotton's *Fasti*, i. 222. See a remarkable letter relating to him in Froude's *Hist. of England*, chap. 24. Reign of Elizabeth, vol. iv. 534, *note*.

[6] Brady's *Irish Reformation*, p. 103.

[7] Mant, i. 375.

[8] *State Papers*, by Brady, p. 93.

Elizabeth, Miler Magrath, Archbishop of Cashel, is singularly conspicuous. The length of his episcopate, the high position which he occupied, and the extraordinary incidents of his career, all give him a claim to special notice.

Magrath, who was born in 1522, was the son of an Ulster chieftain of considerable influence.[1] He was a native of Fermanagh; in early life he joined the fraternity of the Franciscans; and he soon distinguished himself by his insinuating address and his tact in the management of business. In the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth he was sent to Rome to solicit the bishopric of Down and Connor for a scion of old Irish royalty of three and twenty years of age—the brother of Shane O'Neill.[2] The result of this mission may well lead us to suspect the deputy's fidelity; for, whilst an attempt was made to propitiate the youthful applicant by the grant of a pension to be paid out of the revenues of the See, Magrath contrived to obtain for himself the coveted dignity. In October 1565 he was appointed bishop by the Roman consistory.[3] In 1567, when Shane O'Neill finished his career so ingloriously at Cushendun, Miler began to think that, by passing over to Protestantism, he might obtain something better than a titular dignity; and he accordingly intimated to the English Government that he was prepared to entertain the idea of conformity.[4] He was, in consequence, advanced by Queen Elizabeth in 1570 to the bishopric of Clogher; and in the following year was made archbishop of Cashel. About this time he married; and, on the death of his first wife, he entered a second time into wedlock. He led the Queen to believe that, by means of his family influence, he could render important services to her government; and, though Emly had recently been annexed to Cashel, he at length stood so high in royal favour that he obtained the

---

[1] See *Calendar of the Patent and Close Rolls of Chancery in Ireland*, vol. ii., p. 361, by Morrin, where his father is styled "chieftain of Termon Magrath," and where the family property is described.

[2] Brady's *Irish Reformation*, p. 74.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 75.

[4] About this time Magrath forged a letter to the Pope, written as if by Creagh, the Romish Primate of Armagh.—Kelly's *Dissertations*, p. 389. The attempted imposition was detected. *Ibid.*

two additional Sees of Lismore and Waterford.[1] Nor was he contented with these four bishoprics. By his incessant importunity he obtained various other ecclesiastical endowments.[2] He now professed great zeal for Protestantism; complained of the indulgence granted to Romish priests and bishops; petitioned for authority to tender the Oath of Supremacy to all; and especially sought to obtain the privilege of imprisoning Popish recusants. According to his own account he had suffered much in the service of her Majesty; he was a marked man; and he modestly requested the service of a body of horse and foot of not more than one hundred soldiers.[3] But all the while he appears to have been in very little danger. He contrived to maintain an excellent understanding with the Popish party; and, when pretending to assist in the capture of rebels, he gave them warning of their danger, and assisted them in effecting their escape. The Queen's Ministers began at length to suspect his treachery; and one of his letters which fell into their hands placed him in rather an awkward position. "Loving wife," says Miler in this unfortunate communication, "I have already resolved you in my mind touching my cousin Darby Creagh [the Romish Bishop of Cork, a noted plotter against the English Sovereign]; and I desire you now to cause his friends to

---

[1] Harris's *Ware*, i. 484. In 1589, Magrath resigned Lismore and Waterford, when Thomas Wetherhead was appointed to these Sees. Wetherhead lived only about three years; and then the two bishoprics were restored to Magrath, who held them, along with Cashel and Emly, till 1607. When he then resigned them, he obtained Killala and Achonry, which he held till his death along with Cashel and Emly.

[2] Such as the vicarage of Kilmacallan, the rectory of Infra Duos Pontes in Elphin, the rectories of Castle-Conor and Skrine in the diocese of Killala, and the prebend of Dougherne with the rectory of Kilorhim in the diocese of Achonry. Brenan, p. 409; Harris's *Ware*, i. 484; Cotton's *Fasti*, i. 12.

[3] *State Papers*, by Brady, pp. 89-90. This petition is dated July 1584. He alleges that "travelling from his house to Dublin, about Her Majesty's affairs, he was, by certain evil disposed men, robbed of all his money and horses and wounded in seven places in his body." In October 1600 he was allowed pay for ten soldiers. *Pacata Hibernia*, pp. 158-9. At the same time he was allowed "forty shillings a week" for another purpose. *Ibid.* About the same time he was awarded £121. 13*s.* 3*d.* as a reward for stirring up Dermond O'Conner to betray his brother-in-law, the young Earl of Desmond. *Pacata Hibernia*, pp. 185, 193.

send him out of the whole country,[1] if they may; or, if not, to send my orders, for that there is such search to be made for him, that unless he be wise, he shall be taken; and to send from my house all the priests that you are wont to have . . . . Accomplish the contents of my other letters, and burn this presently, and all the letters that you know yourself." [2]

This letter was written from Greenwich, where Miler was probably employed in soliciting some new favour as a reward for his public services. It never reached his "loving wife," as it was intercepted; and the writer found it rather difficult to give such an account of it as was satisfactory to the Government. He protested that he was an injured man; that his enemies had libelled him; and had "counterfeited his own hand to his utter harm." [3] "Many hard measures," says he, "have diversely been offered me; my houses have been burned, my castles spoiled, my tenants preded [preyed upon], my servants murdered, and my own life many ways endangered." [4] But these statements appear to have made little impression on the Lord Deputy. He still continued to denounce "the great *shams of service* made by the Archbishop of Cashel;" [5] and soon afterwards it was discovered that Magrath had again suddenly left Ireland "without license, carrying with him great sums of money, besides plate and jewels." [6] He now repaired to London, where he managed to give so plausible an account of his proceedings to the Queen, that she continued her patronage. At her death he lost the favour of the Court; and when far advanced in life, the wretched schemer entered into a secret correspondence with the Provincial of the Franciscans in Ireland with a view to return to the Church of Rome.[7] He long hesitated to take the decisive step; but there is reason to believe that he was received into communion shortly before his death.[8] He did

---

[1] See Meehan's *Fate and Fortunes of Hugh O'Neill*, p. 42, *note*.

[2] Brady's *Irish Reformation*, pp. 120-1. This letter is dated 26th of June, 1592.

[3] *State Papers*, by Brady, p. 136. This letter is dated May 6th, 1593.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 134.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 138.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 139.

[7] Brenan's *Ecc. Hist. of Ireland*, p. 409.

[8] It appears from a document published in Brenan's *Ecc. Hist.*, p. 410, that he

not, however, venture to avow the change; for, whilst he lived, he kept possession of all his ecclesiastical preferments. He died, at the advanced age of one hundred,[1] in December 1622, having occupied the Archbishopric of Cashel about fifty-two years.[2]

Though there were no great distilleries in the country in the sixteenth century, Irishmen were already well acquainted with *usquebaugh*,[3] or *aqua vitæ*, and it was a favourite beverage with this Southern Metropolitan. An English officer who visited Ireland in 1602, and who has left behind him an account of his journey, describes Magrath as pouring it down his throat "by day and by night; and that, not for hilarity only, which," says he, "would be praiseworthy, but for constant drunkenness, which is detestable."[4] It was to be expected that such a prelate would neglect the care even of the church-buildings of his province. The filthy state of his own cathedral of Cashel was the subject of general comment. In 1601 Sir Robert Cecil, in a letter to the Earl of Desmond, complains of it bitterly. "There is," says he, "great scandal bruited of the Bishop of Cashel, that he doth very irreligiously suffer his church to lie like an hogstye. . . . I pray you move the Lord President to expostulate with him, even for the honour of her Majesty and God's Church, wherein he hath so supreme a calling."[5] Though so often muddled with

---

contemplated returning to the Church of Rome in January 1613. He had promised the same fourteen years before to O'Neill. But he seems to have deferred the final step till some time before his death in December 1622. See King's *Primer*, p. 1224.

[1] O'Harte, the R.C. Bishop of Achonry who was present at the Council of Trent, died in 1603, at the same age. Brady's *Irish Reformation*, p. 160.

[2] Harris's *Ware*, i. 485. John Lynch, who was made Bishop of Elphin in 1584, also died a Papist. He resigned his See in 1611, shortly before his death. He greatly wasted the Church property.—Cotton's *Fasti*, iv. 125; King's *Primer*, p. 1223; Mant, i. 280.

[3] "Usquebaugh—pronounced in Irish *Wisgé-baha*, *i.e.*, Aqua Vitae or the Water of Life—now better known by its first component word, as *Whiskey*."—*Ulster Journal of Archæology*, vol. ii., p. 85. The reader may find an interesting article on the early use of Aqua Vitae in Ireland in the same Journal, vol. vi., p. 283.

[4] An account of a journey of Captain Josias Bodley into Lecale in Ulster in the year 1602. *Ulster Journal of Archæology*, vol. ii., p. 85. Captain Bodley was the brother of Sir Thomas Bodley, the founder of the famous Oxford library.

[5] *Carew MSS.*, 1601-1603, pp. 12, 13.

whiskey, the Archbishop's passion for intrigue was inveterate. He seems at one time to have been privy to a conspiracy for poisoning O'Neill,[1] the great political champion of the Romanists—and yet, in 1599, he privately conveyed to the same chieftain an assurance that he intended to abjure Protestantism.[2] The whole career of this prelate is characterized by insatiable avarice and consummate hypocrisy. He embraced the Reformed faith, not because he was convinced of its truth, but because he coveted its secular advantages; and, not content with the legitimate revenues of four Bishoprics and other valuable livings, he made fraudulent leases of the Church lands, and thus enriched himself and his family by the most shameless peculation. By his arts and connivance Cashel and Emly—once so munificently endowed—were left worth only £60 a-year.[3] As his public life, from beginning to end, was a course of imposture, even his funeral is said to have been a sham; for whilst the coffin supposed to contain his remains[4] was buried in the cathedral of Cashel, his body

[1] See an account of a proposal by a priest to poison O'Neill, Earl of Tyrone, with the host, in the *Kilkenny Archæological Journal*, new series, vol. i., p. 411. *Bishop Macraith* is there mentioned as likely to assist.

[2] See Tyrone's letter to Con O'Neill, dated 29th March, 1599, in Meehan's *Fate and Fortunes of Hugh O'Neill*, p. 536. The same document may be found in the *Carew MSS.*, 1589-1600, pp. 296-297. O'Sullivan states that, in his later years, he ceased to persecute the Romanists:—"Sacerdotes non inquirit, neque Catholicos a vera religione subducere laborat."—*Compendium*, iv. 12. At this time he had probably returned to the Church of Rome.

[3] Brady's *Irish Reformation*, p. 122. Mant, i. 280.

[4] Harris's *Ware*, i. 485. Before his death he erected a monument for himself in the Cathedral of Cashel, and the concluding lines of the inscription have been supposed to refer to the absence of his body from the tomb, and to his apostasy:—

"Hic ubi sum positus, non sum, sum non, ubi non sum,
Sum nec in ambobus, sum sed utroque loco.
Dominus est qui me judicat. 1 Cor. iv.
Qui stat, caveat ne cadat."

Which has been thus translated:—

Here where I'm placed, I'm not; and thus the case is,
I'm not in both, yet am in both the places.
He that judgeth me is the Lord.
Let him who stands take care lest he fall.

No wonder that Camden speaks of him as "a man of *uncertain faith and credit*, and of a *depraved life*." See Cotton's *Fasti*, v. 3.

is reported to have been privately conveyed to a popish place of interment. His sons, who inherited great wealth—the fruits of their father's dishonesty—openly joined the communion of the Church of Rome; and the Crown, with little success, endeavoured to compel them to disgorge their ecclesiastical plunder.[1]

Miler Magrath belonged to one of the native tribes; Shane O'Neill employed him confidentially;[2] and other persons of note throughout the island were connected with him by the ties of kindred. He possessed much of the volubility of his countrymen; he was quick-witted and plausible; and his letters supply proof that he did not want the pen of a ready writer. His knowledge of public affairs, and his presumed ability to aid the Irish administration in its difficulties, had recommended him for ecclesiastical promotion. But his preferment was a grave mistake; for no government could depend for assistance in emergencies on a man so selfish and double-minded. The stream of sedition never dried up in Ireland; and various circumstances now contributed to swell the current. The native chiefs, including the kinsmen of Magrath, were particularly discontented. Several recent attempts to promote the peace of the country, by colonizing parts of it with British settlers, had inspired them with alarm.[3] The proposal to reduce the whole island to shire-land also gave them deep dissatisfaction. These petty potentates had long exercised almost unlimited authority. Accustomed within their own territories to rule unchallenged, they viewed with apprehension the division of the several provinces into counties, the establishment of the authority of sheriffs and judges everywhere outside the pale, and the introduction of other

---

1 Brady's *Irish Reformation*, p. 122. See also *Calendar of Patent and Close Rolls of Chancery in Ireland in the Reign of Charles I.*—first to eighth year inclusive—by Morrin, pp. 153, 154. Dublin, 1863.

2 Brady's *Irish Reformation*, p. 75.

3 About 1570. Sir Thomas Smith obtained from Elizabeth a grant of lands in the Ards, County Down; and a few years afterwards the Earl of Essex obtained a more extensive grant of territory in Ulster. Both these attempts at colonization were unsuccessful. In 1569 Sir Peter Carew and others made an abortive attempt at colonization in the South of Ireland. See Froude, Reign of Elizabeth, vol. iv. 492.

measures calculated to circumscribe or annihilate their old feudal privileges. They felt that, were such arrangements carried out, the days of their capricious supremacy would be ended. The tillers of the soil were well pleased with the prospect of being placed under English law, as their position in the social scale would thus be elevated and improved; and they would thus enjoy an amount of comfort and independence to which they had hitherto been strangers. But they were surrounded by other parties, as well as the chieftains, in whose presence they scarcely dared to give utterance to their sentiments, and who regarded the projected changes with extreme aversion. These malcontents—though often little better than mere savages—reputed themselves gentlemen; they were of the kindred of the chieftains, and boasted of their lineage: they scorned to labour; they lived very much by plunder; and, when not engaged in some predatory or military expedition, they wandered about in idleness, quartering themselves upon the peasantry, and oppressing them by their exactions. The idea of the reduction of all Ireland into shire-land, in which impartial justice was to dominate, very much disturbed these gentry; for they saw that, under such a system, the days of their thievery and sloth must cease, and that they must make up their minds either to work or starve. But they could not decently avow the real cause of their displeasure; and they were very much in want of an excuse for proclaiming their hostility to the schemes of government. The friars, however, at once supplied them with a most respectable apology. The Church, they said, had been assailed; the Queen had attempted its destruction; she had, in consequence, been excommunicated; and, as the Pope had required the people of Ireland to renounce allegiance to her, all good Catholics were bound to obey his mandate. The dread of the power of England served considerably to diminish the influence of these statements; but the more enthusiastic were ready to applaud the call to rebellion.

Before this time a quarrel, in which the chief of the Protestant nobility was concerned, had given much uneasiness to the Government. The south of Ireland had long been

disturbed by disputes between the Earl of Ormond and the Earl of Desmond;[1] and when the Lord Deputy proceeded, by command of the Queen, to adjudicate between them, he was unable to put an end to the litigation. The Earl of Desmond refused to submit to his award, and used language so insolent and seditious that the Viceroy deemed it prudent to arrest both his brother, Sir John Desmond, and himself. They were soon afterwards conveyed to England, where they were committed close prisoners to the Tower.[2]

The Earl of Desmond had immense possessions: he ruled, with sovereign authority, in the kingdom of Kerry; and he was a chief of the Fitzgeralds—one of the most powerful families in Ireland.[3] His imprisonment gave deadly offence to all his followers; and the plan of an insurrection was soon concocted. Meanwhile the King of Spain had been secretly fanning the flame of rebellion. Indignant at Elizabeth for upholding the cause of the Reformation, and irritated by her proceedings otherwise, he sought to vent his spleen by fomenting treason among her Irish subjects. The Pope came to his aid; and, by fulminating against her his bull of excommunication, exhibited his anxiety to strip her of all her dominions. There is no evidence that Desmond was very much attached to Romanism. Under other circumstances he would perhaps have quietly accepted the reformed ritual. He had lately promised "as to the furtherance of religion in Munster, that, *having no knowledge in learning*, and being ignorant of what was to be done in this behalf, he would aid and maintain whatever should be appointed by commissioners nominated for the purpose."[4] But Ormond, his great

[1] Desmond claimed lands and revenues possessed by Ormond, and attempted to seize them by force of arms. Ormond defeated him and took him prisoner. As the Ormondians conveyed him from the battle field, stretched on a bier, the party exclaimed in triumph "Where is now the great lord of Desmond?" The wounded man proudly replied, "Where but in his proper place? *Still upon the necks of the Butlers.*"—Leland, ii. 238.

[2] *Ibid.* ii. 240.

[3] The family of the Earl of Desmond was a younger branch of the house of Fitzgerald or the Geraldines. Hallam, *Constit. History of England*, p. 838. The Earl of Kildare, the heir of the famous Anglo-Irish Chief, who was Viceroy in the beginning of the reign of Henry VIII., was the head of the family.

[4] Leland, ii. 239; Froude, xi. 176.

enemy, was a Protestant—a fact which certainly did not contribute to increase his inclination to conformity. He now professed wonderful zeal for Popery; and in this way secured an amount of sympathy, both at home and abroad, on which he could not otherwise have calculated. His relative James Fitzmaurice, or Fitzgerald, already headed an insurrection; seduced several other chieftains into rebellion; and sent emissaries to the Pope and the King of Spain to solicit aid.[1] For a time this movement created great alarm, and the insurgents carried all before them; but they were soon encountered by the Queen's troops, and completely discomfited. James Fitzmaurice, their leader, was obliged in 1572 to throw himself at the feet of the Lord Deputy; he was for a time detained in prison; but having promised, with many protestations, that he never would offend again, Elizabeth at length consented to grant him a pardon.[2]

This signal failure did not induce Fitzmaurice to abandon his schemes of rebellion. Though he was indebted to the Queen for his liberation, and though he had pledged himself so solemnly to deport himself henceforth as her loyal subject,[3] his antipathy to her person and government was in no degree abated. Withdrawing to the Continent, he sought to secure the support of the King of France, by describing the discontent of the Irish people, and by showing with what ease the country could be snatched from the English Sovereign. But as he obtained no encouragement at a Court then so much

---

[1] According to the *Annals of the Four Masters*, in A.D. 1569, Fitzmaurice "and the English and Irish in Munster, from the Barrow to Carn-Ui-Neid (near Mizen Head), entered into a unanimous and firm confederacy with him *against the Queen's Parliament*."—O'Donovan's *Annals*, v. 1631. The Viceroy was authorized, by the Parliament held immediately before, to divide the whole island into counties. Other regulations made by it gave offence to these insurgents. See Leland, ii. 244.

[2] Leland, ii. 253, 267; Froude, chap. xxiv., Reign of Elizabeth, vol. iv., pp. 541-2. Fitzmaurice made his submission both in English and Irish in the Church of Killmallock on the 23rd of February, 1573. On this occasion he said, among other humiliating acknowledgments:—"And now, with the eyes of my heart sore weeping and bewailing my most devilish life past, I acknowledge myself to have most wickedly rebelled against God, and most undutifully against my prince."—*Submission before Sir John Perrot.*

[3] See Ware's *Annals*, A.D. 1597; Cox, 355, 337.

distracted by powerful factions, he passed on into Spain—in the expectation that Philip II. would give him a better reception. Nor was he disappointed. Philip—provoked beyond measure at Elizabeth because she was understood to sympathize with his revolted subjects in the Netherlands—hailed with delight the prospect of making reprisals by patronizing rebellion in Ireland. But, with characteristic caution, he deemed it prudent to consult the Pope; and Fitzmaurice was sent into Italy to submit his plans to the consideration of the Head of the Catholic Church.

In Rome the reception of the Irish chieftain was everything that he could have desired. He was there warmly recommended to Gregory XIII. by Sanders,[1] the famous English champion of Popery, and Allen,[2] another Jesuit—both of whom at the time were residing in the pontifical city.[3] Arrangements were made for an invasion; and a bull was drawn up addressed "to all the prelates, princes, earls, barons, and the entire clergy, nobility, and people of the kingdom of Ireland," calling upon them to support Fitzmaurice in his efforts for the recovery of their liberty, and the defence of the Church. "Of the different provinces of the Christian world which are separated from us by a wide extent of intervening climes, the nation of the Irish," says Gregory, "is one which this Apostolic See has ever embraced with singular love and charity, for the constancy of its fervent devotion, and inviolable attachment to the Catholic religion and the Church of Rome, so often manifested. For this cause we are the more moved by the afflictions and calamities of that kingdom; and anxious, as much as in us lies, to provide at once for the liberty and peace of the people, as far as their

---

[1] Mr. Froude states that Sanders was probably present at the burning of Cranmer, and that he attended the Council of Trent. His work on *The Origin and Progress of the English Schism* is a strange tissue of falsehood, malignity, and fanaticism. See Froude, xi. 203-4.

[2] Allen is sometimes described as an "Irish Jesuit." If so, he is not to be confounded with Cardinal Allen, who was an Englishman. See his letter dated 28th of April, 1588, in Froude, xii. 452. This Allen was a medical doctor. See Moran's *Archbishops*, 195, *note*.

[3] Haverty, p. 412.

bodies are concerned, and for the salvation of their souls. Accordingly, as we have lately learned to our exceeding great and heartfelt sorrow, from that excellent and distinguished man James Geraldine, Lord of Kiericourithy, and Governor-General of Desmond in the absence of the Earl of Desmond, what numberless and bitter hardships good men are there suffering for their love to the orthodox faith, and in defence of the true religion, through the persecution of Elizabeth, who, *hateful alike to God and man*, domineers proudly and impiously both in England and Ireland; and as the said James, influenced by zeal for the house of God, and a desire for the restoration of our holy religion, as well as by those principles of patriotism, courage, and magnanimity wherewith he is naturally endowed, is proposing, with the Lord's help, to shake off from your necks a yoke of slavery so cruel and intolerable, and hopes that he shall find many to aid him in so pious an endeavour; we therefore admonish and exhort you, all and singular, by the bowels of the mercy of God, that, *discerning the seasonableness of this opportunity*, you will each, according to his power, give your strenuous aid to the piety and valour of such a leader; and *not be afraid of a woman who having been long since bound by the chain of an anathema, and growing more and more vile every day, has departed from the Lord and the Lord from her;* and many disasters will deservedly come upon her. That you may do this with the greater alacrity we grant to all and singular of you who, being contrite and confessing, or having the purpose of confessing, shall follow the said General, and join his army to maintain and defend the Catholic faith, or who shall aid this expedition and forward his holy purpose by counsel, countenance, provisions, or any other means, a plenary indulgence and remission of all sins, in the same form as is commonly granted to those who set out for the wars against the Turks, and for the recovery of the Holy Land." [1]

[1] King's *Primer*, pp. 1262-4; Phelan's *Remains*, vol. ii., pp. 204-6. This Bull is dated 25th February, 1577, that is, according to our reckoning, 1578. Gregory changed the Calendar in 1582. See Burke's *Hibernia Dominicana*, p. 138, *note*.

Fitzmaurice, as we have seen, had already shamefully violated his solemn engagements to Elizabeth; and, furnished with this authority for rebellion from a personage calling himself the Vicar of Christ, he prepared to take his departure from the pontifical city. A banner was consecrated and delivered to him; Sanders, who was invested with the dignity of papal legate, undertook to go with him into Ireland; and Allen also agreed to share his fortunes.[1] The conspirators were dismissed with the pontifical blessing; and, supplied with some money, they repaired to King Philip to obtain the additional means necessary to fit them for their enterprise.

When Fitzmaurice arrived in Spain a blight had fallen on his prospects. An unprincipled adventurer of English birth, named Stukeley, who had been placed by the Pope at the head of a body of eight hundred men,[2] and who had been expected to co-operate in the invasion of Ireland, had perished in the north of Africa. Having embarked at Civita Vecchia and stopped at Lisbon—as the vessels in which he conveyed his troops had not proved seaworthy,[3]—Sebastian, King of Portugal, gave him large promises of help, on condition that he would meanwhile cross over with him to Morocco, and aid him in a war in which he was about to engage with one of the Mohammedan princes. The King and Stukeley lost their lives in a great battle near Tangier; so that Fitzmaurice, at the very outset, was deprived of the services of a military officer from whom he had expected much, as well as of the support of most of the troops collected for the expedition. But Philip encouraged him to persevere; and, accompanied by Sanders and Allen, by a few Spaniards, and by some refugees from England and Ireland, he landed on the 17th of July, 1579, on the coast of Kerry.[4] "Two friars stepped first on shore; a bishop followed, mitre on head and crozier in hand; then Sanders, with the consecrated banner; and after

[1] Leland, ii. 268; Ware's *Annals*, A.D. 1579.

[2] This Stukeley had been already in Ireland, and had excited the odium of the natives by the pillage and destruction of the monasteries. Froude, x. 524; xi. 140; Leland, ii. 267.

[3] Froude, *Hist. of England*, xi. 140.

[4] Froude, xi. 208; Leland, ii. 269.

him, Fitzmaurice."[1] A proclamation in Irish immediately afterwards appeared, announcing the object of the expedition. This manifesto thus proceeds:[2]—

"Our holy father, Pope Gregory the Thirteenth, Christ's Vicar on earth, perceiving what dishonour to God and his saints, what destruction to Christian souls in Ireland and England, what sedition, tumult, spoil, and murder have fallen to Scotland, France, and Flanders by the procurement of Elizabeth the pretended Queen of England; perceiving also that neither the warning of other Catholic princes and good Christians, nor the sentence of Pope Pius the Fifth, his predecessor, nor the long sufferance of God, could cause her to forsake her schism, heresy, and wicked attempts; as he now purposeth, not without the consent of other Catholic potentates, to deprive her actually of the unjust possession of these kingdoms, which she useth for the chief instruments of her impieties; so he first of all attempteth her said actual deprivation by the means of our dear country, wherein he doth us more honour and favour than easily can be expressed in words. . . . . This one thing I will say, which I wish to be imprinted on all our hearts, if all we that in deed are of a good mind would openly and speedily profess our faith by resorting to His Holiness's banner, and by commanding all your people and countries *to keep no other but the Catholic faith, and forthwith to expel all false teachers and schismatical service*, you would not only deliver your country from heresy and tyranny, but also do that most godly and noble act without any danger at all."

It is obvious from this proclamation that Fitzmaurice and his partizans had no idea whatever of establishing anything like religious equality in Ireland. They might complain of the hardships they experienced under a Protestant government; but they here plainly indicated their determination, as soon as they possessed the power, to act sternly on the

[1] Froude, xi. 208.

[2] This declaration, addressed to "the Prelates, Princes, Lords, and people of Ireland," may be found in the *Carew MSS.*, 1515-1574, 397-9. By mistake it is there dated 1569. The Bull of Gregory, to which it refers, was issued as we have seen, in 1578. Gregory was made Pope in May 1572.

principle of intolerance. They expected the Irish chieftains to command all their people "to keep no other but the Catholic faith, and forthwith to expel all false teachers and schismatical service." It does not appear that this manifesto was received by the natives with the enthusiasm which it was expected to awaken. On his arrival Fitzmaurice was joined by the two brothers of the Earl of Desmond; but the Earl himself kept aloof; and others, on whose assistance he had calculated, did not seem disposed to rally round his standard.[1] Under pretence of a pilgrimage to the Holy Cross of Tipperary, in fulfilment of a vow which he had made in Spain, he set out towards Limerick—in the hope of awakening the zeal of some of the chieftains of that district. But his journey terminated ingloriously. Having, on his way, taken possession of some draught-horses, the owners resisted their capture; a fight ensued; and Fitzmaurice was killed in the struggle.[2] Sir John Desmond, a man of worthless character, now succeeded to the command of the invaders; Gregory XIII.—who was duly informed of the progress of the enterprise—was pleased to ratify his appointment; and, in a fresh bull, recommended him to his countrymen as a person "of eminent piety and magnanimity."[3] A petty advantage, gained about this time by the insurgents, was greatly magnified: some, who had hitherto declined to compromise themselves, took courage; and the rebels soon increased to a force of two thousand men. In a plain adjoining the old abbey of Monaster-Nena, they prepared for an engagement with the soldiers of Elizabeth. Before the battle, the Jesuit Allen rode through the ranks of the insurgents, displaying the papal standard, distributing his benedictions, and giving assurances of victory.[4] The event speedily falsified his predictions. After much desperate fight-

---

[1] Haverty, 414.

[2] Leland, ii. 272; Haverty, p. 416. Mr. Froude has given a somewhat different account of this affair. See his *Hist. of England*, xi. 213.

[3] This Bull may be found in King's *Primer*, supplementary volume, 1272-5. It is dated 13th May, 1580. See also *The Geraldines*, by O'Daly, translated by Meehan, pp. 74-5. Dublin, 1847, where it is abridged. It may be found also in Peter Lombard's *Commentarius*, cap. xxiii.

[4] Ware's *Annals*, A.D. 157; Leland, ii. 275.

ing, the English prevailed; and the body of Allen is said to have been found by the conquerors among a heap of slain.[1]

The Earl of Desmond had been, for some time past, suspected of disloyalty; and his complicity in the rebellion was fully established by several papers discovered among the baggage of this emissary of Rome.[2] Finding it useless to attempt a continuance of the system of equivocation, the Earl now openly avowed his hostility: and Munster was, in consequence, long involved in the miseries of war. A fresh supply of seven or eight hundred Spanish and Italian troops—who landed at Limerick in the autumn of 1580—sustained only for a time the hopes of the insurgents.[3] These foreigners succeeded in completing the erection of a fort; and, when summoned to surrender, returned a defiant answer.[4] But a tremendous cannonade quickly obliged them to demand a parley. When the Italians were asked why they had landed in Ireland, they replied "that they were sent by the Pope for the defence of the Catholic faith."[5] The whole party surrendered at discretion, and were all cruelly massacred.[6] Some time before, Sir James Desmond, brother of the Earl, had been badly wounded in an action near Cork. He was taken to that city, and executed as a traitor. His brother, Sir John, in the beginning of the year 1581, also perished. Sanders, the Jesuit,—one of the chief concocters

[1] Leland, ii. 275. It is quite clear that the Jesuit here spoken of could not have been the famous Cardinal Allen, as he lived many years afterwards. See Froude, xii. 452.

[2] Leland, ii. 275.

[3] *Ibid.* 281.

[4] They are reported to have said, in the first instance, that "they held the fort for the Pope and the King of Spain," and that they were sent "to extirpate heresy, and to reduce the land to the obedience of King Philip."—Cox, 1st Part, p. 368; Leland, ii. 282.

[5] Froude, xi. 236.

[6] According to the reports of Romish writers "the lives and liberties of the foreign soldiers were guaranteed by the deputy."—Haverty, p. 424. The poet Spenser, who was present, and who had the best opportunity of knowing the facts, denies this statement most positively. Haverty admits that Spenser is supported by the report of the deputy himself made at the time. See also Ware's *Annals*, A.D. 1580. The massacre was sufficiently atrocious without any such aggravation.

of the rebellion,—worn out with hunger and fatigue, died in miserable circumstances. No one was with him in his last moments: his body was mangled by beasts:[1] but, when at length discovered by his partizans, it received the tribute of an honourable funeral.[2] On the 11th of November, 1583, the Earl of Desmond himself finished his career. Deserted by almost all his followers, and hunted from place to place, he was in the end overtaken and killed in a wretched cabin a few miles from Tralee.[3] His estates of upwards of half a million of acres, spreading over the counties of Limerick, Cork, Kerry, Waterford, Tipperary, and Dublin, were subsequently forfeited to the Crown.[4] Thus was extinguished the greatness of the house of Desmond, a family which had flourished in Ireland in rude splendour since the time of the English invasion, and which had long proved formidable to the Colonial government.

The death of this Earl virtually put an end to the commotions which, for so many years, had disturbed the South of Ireland. The country—long before so desolate—was now reduced to the last degree of wretchedness. Each party, in its turn, swept, like a destroying angel, over the land. The Geraldines "proceeded to destroy, demolish, burn, and completely consume every fortress, town, corn-field, and habitation between those places to which they came, lest the English might get possession of them, and dwell in them; and, on

[1] Leland, ii. 287; Ware's *Annals*, A.D. 1582.

[2] The statement that the R.C. Bishop of Killaloe administered the last sacraments to him appears to be without foundation. See Froude, xi. 240. Peter Walsh speaks of Sanders as "wandering *alone* in the mountains of Kerry and starving there to death under a tree."—*History of the Remonstrance. Address to the Catholics*, p. xxxiv.

[3] Cox, first part, p. 368.

[4] Cox gives the rental of the Desmond estates at the time of their forfeiture as upwards of seven thousand per annum. Cox, first part, p. 392. About the same time the rental of all Ulster is calculated by Spenser at eighteen thousand per annum. *View of the State of Ireland*, p. 200. Dublin, 1809. Sir Walter Raleigh obtained a large grant of the Desmond property, including a great part of the town of Youghal. He was the first to introduce the culture of the potato into the country. The poet Spenser himself obtained a grant of 3,000 acres at Kilcoleman in County Cork, and composed there part of his *Faery Queene*. The entire population of Ireland in 1581 was computed at 600,000. See Froude, xi. 247.

the other hand, the English consigned to a like destruction every house and habitation, and every rick and stack of corn, to which they came, to injure the Geraldines, so that, between them, the country was left one levelled plain, without corn or edifices."[1] "Countless and indescribable were the injuries mutually done upon each other by the English and the Geraldines during this time."[2] The Irish annalists who make these statements, though Roman Catholics themselves, condemn, in the strongest terms, the proceedings of the great southern rebel. Speaking of the year in which Desmond died, they tell how, "when the long nights had set in, the insurgents and *robbers of Munster* began to collect about him, and prepared to rekindle the torch of war. But God," say they, "thought it time to suppress, close, and finish this war of the Geraldines . . . . Were it not that he was given to plunder and insurrection, as he really was, this fate of the Earl of Desmond would have been one of the mournful stories of Ireland . . . . It was no wonder that the vengeance of God should exterminate the Geraldines for their opposition to their sovereign."[3] The monks who bear this testimony evidently repudiated the idea that such men as the Earl of Desmond should be celebrated as martyrs for Catholicity.

We may often demur to the conclusions of these Irish annalists when they pronounce upon the spiritual significance of particular occurrences: but, in the fate of the Earl of Desmond, we feel bound to concur with them in recognizing the judgment of heaven. This great Anglo-Irish chief was alike ignorant and vindictive, cruel and unprincipled. By the rebellions of himself and his kinsmen, Ireland was involved in unutterable misery. The poet Spenser about this time settled in the country: and there is not perhaps in all history a more terrible picture than that of the state of Munster at the period before us drawn by his graphic pen. "Notwithstanding," says he, "that the same was a most rich and plentiful country, full of corn and cattle, that you would have

---

[1] O'Donovan's *Annals of the Four Masters*, A.D. 1579, vol. v., p. 1723.

[2] *Ibid.* A.D. 1580, vol. v., p. 1735.

[3] *Ibid.* vol. v., pp. 1793, 1795, 1797.

thought they should have been able to stand long; yet, ere one year and a half, they were brought to such wretchedness, as that any stony heart would have rued (mourned) the same. Out of every corner of the woods and glens, they came creeping forth upon their hands, for their legs could not bear them; they looked like anatomies of death; they spake like ghosts crying out of their graves; they did eat the dead carrions—happy where they could find them—yea, and one another soon after, insomuch as the very carcases they spared not to scrape out of their graves; and, if they found a plot of water-cresses or shamrocks, there they flocked as to a feast for the time, yet not able long to continue therewithal; in short space there was none almost left, and a most populous and plentiful country suddenly left void of man and beast."[1] "At this period," add the Irish annalists, "it was commonly said that the lowing of a cow, or the voice of the ploughman, could scarcely be heard from Dunqueen (the most western part of Kerry) to Cashel in Munster."[2] "There hath died by famine only," said a high government official, "not so few as thirty thousand in this province in less than half a year, besides others that are hanged and killed."[3] Munster was now in the lowest state of moral and spiritual degradation; superstition and crime were united in close fellowship: and a large number of the chieftains were very little better than so many leaders of banditti. As any man of Christian feeling gazed on the melancholy scenes presented in the southern province, he could scarcely fail to recognise a most awful illustration of the truth that God "turneth a fruitful land into barrenness for the wickedness of them that dwell therein."[4]

---

1 *View of the State of Ireland*, p. 166.

2 O'Donovan's *Annals of the Four Masters*, A.D. 1582, vol. v., p. 1785.

3 Sir Warham St. Leger to Sir John Perrot, April 22nd, 1582. Froude, xi. 249.

4 Ps. cvii. 34.

CHAPTER V.

FROM THE DEATH OF THE EARL OF DESMOND TO THE DEATH OF QUEEN ELIZABETH. A.D. 1583 TO A.D. 1603.

THE great religious awakening of the sixteenth century was inaugurated amidst scenes of martyrdom. In Scotland, Patrick Hamilton, and others who were the heralds of the Reformation, perished in the flames. Henry VIII. consigned to the same cruel fate those who refused to believe in the existence of purgatory, or who denied the dogma of transubstantiation. In the reign of Queen Mary, Cranmer and Ridley stand at the head of crowds of victims who were burnt to death for the profession of Protestantism. When we turn our eyes to the Continent about the same period, we behold still more appalling scenes. In the Low Countries, in Italy, and elsewhere, the demon of intolerance appears in hideous form: and Romish priests are ever and anon presented to us as among the keenest bloodhounds of persecution. During the reign of Elizabeth some of the most awful tragedies recorded in the annals of human suffering were enacted in France and Spain. Who has not been told of the horrors of the Bartholomew massacre? Who does not know that Pope Gregory XIII.—the same who excommunicated the Queen of England and patronized James Fitzmaurice—heard with delight of the slaughter of the good Coligni and the Huguenots, and ordered a medal to be struck to commemorate the butchery? In the reign of Philip II., the Spanish Auto da Fè—where troops of heretics were committed to the fire—was an affair of frequent occurrence. The King and his Court were sometimes present at the

execution: the Auto was kept as a grand holiday: and multitudes of onlookers gloated over the agony of the burning unbelievers in Romanism. Wherever the Pope had power, the Inquisition established its enginery of terror: and the spirit of religious inquiry languished and expired in its dark dungeons.

In the time of Elizabeth there was nothing of this kind in Ireland. During the whole of her long reign not a single individual was burnt here for his religious opinions. We have seen that, soon after she ascended the throne, the Irish Parliament repealed the Statutes for the punishment of heretics. The bishops, the clergy, and other officials,[1] who persisted in refusing to take the oath of Supremacy were liable to severe inflictions: but this oath was seldom rigorously pressed: and the Queen was willing to accept it with explanations which modified some of its most objectionable features.[2] A fine of a shilling, for absence from the Protestant worship on the Lord's Day without some fair excuse, was the only penalty which the mass of the community could legally suffer for nonconformity: and even this was rarely

[1] Brenan absurdly asserts that "*every individual in the kingdom* was commanded to come forward and acknowledge the spiritual supremacy of Elizabeth." He quotes Peter Lombard as his authority for this statement. Brenan's *Ecc. Hist. of Ireland*, p. 407. Dublin, 1864. Lombard says nothing of the kind. His words are:—"Ab omnibus iis, *qui ad officia publica assumuntur*, sacramentum exigeretur." —*Commentarius*, cap. xix. p. 115. There is clear evidence that Roman Catholics acted as judges and captains in this reign. In such cases the oath of Supremacy was dispensed with. See Kelly's *Dissertations*, pp. 316, 325. See also *State Papers*, by Brady, pp. 60, 61.

[2] The Queen, early in her reign, published a series of injunctions, one of which related to the oath of supremacy. "Because," says Collier, "the oath of Supremacy had been misconstrued by several persons, as if the Kings or Queens of this realm had challenged 'an authority and power of ministry of Divine service in the Church,' the Queen disclaims the supremacy in this sense; and that Her Majesty neither does nor ever will challenge such authority: and that she intends to stretch the regale no farther than it was carried by King Henry VIII. and King Edward VI., and 'was of ancient time due to the imperial crown of this realm:' and how far this reached, the admonition proceeds to explain: and that is, 'under God to have the sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons born within these realms, dominions, and countries, either ecclesiastical or temporal, so as no foreign power ought to have any superiority over them.'"—*Ecc. History of Great Britain*, vol. vi., 256-7.

exacted. With such facts before us, we may well be perplexed by certain statements put forward with great confidence in the pages of some Roman Catholic writers. A few of these representations may here be noticed.

"Unheard of cruelties," says one, "were committed *on the inhabitants of Munster*[1] by the English commanders. Great companies of these natives, men, women, and children, were often forced into castles, and other houses, which were then set on fire; and if any of them attempted to escape from the flames, they were shot or stabbed by the soldiers who guarded them. It was a diversion to these monsters of men to take up infants on the points of their spears, and whirl them about in their agony—excusing their cruelty by saying that, if they were suffered to live, they would become popish rebels. Many of the women, too, were found hanging on trees, with their children at their breasts strangled with their mothers' hair."[2]

This thrilling passage has been lately adduced to illustrate the "persecution of the Irish Catholics during the reign of Elizabeth." It professes to be taken from a work, written in the year 1600, by Peter Lombard, afterwards Roman Catholic Archbishop of Armagh.[3] The author was then living in Rome:

[1] That the reader may see how very loose and unreliable is this translation, we shall here give the original words of Lombard with the passage immediately preceding:—"Ita ut Jacobus Eustachius Vice-Comes Baltinglasii coactus fuerit in externas regiones occulte fugere, ubi et brevi postea obiit: Joannes et Jacobus Geraldini fratres Comitis Desmoniae, in pugna capti, tanquam perduelles in partes sunt discerpti: Comes ipse Geraldus Geraldinus dum latebras cogeretur quaerere insidiose caesus periit. Quibus pro Anglorum voto ita succedentibus, quamvis nulli jam restarent, qui eorum potentiae resistebant, non tamen illi desierunt *in istorum proceres, propinquos, familiares, subditos quosque saevire*, idque tam diris ac feris modis, ut sine horrore vix audiri possint aut narrari. Nam in quibus villis, castellis, pagis, plures adhuc superesse deprehenderant, ut compendiosae mortis genere eos tollerent, coactis omnibus sine ullo respectu aetatis, sexus, conditionis, meriti, in antiqua horrea, injecto igne sic inclusos extinxerunt," &c.—*Commentarius*, cap. xxiii., 145-6. Dublin, 1868.

[2] Moran, *Archbishops of Dublin*, p. 121, professing to quote from Peter Lombard. Dublin, 1864. Dr. Moran is the nephew of Cardinal Cullen.

[3] Peter Lombard was born in Waterford in 1554. In 1572 he went to Louvain, where he became professor of philosophy and theology. He was a man of considerable learning, and a keen Ultramontanist. See before, p. 388, *note* (1).

he knew nothing of what was passing in his native country except by report: and the friars, who repaired to Louvain where he long resided, or to the Italian capital where he spent the rest of his days, were, in all likelihood, the parties from whom he received his information. They were not the most trustworthy reporters. Their grand object was to foster hostility to Elizabeth: and they knew well that the Pope and his friends were only too ready to give heed to any tale calculated to cast discredit on her government. Such testimony cannot, therefore, be received with implicit confidence. But the quotation itself is a miserably garbled extract—fitted only to delude the reader. The language of Peter Lombard is here quite misrepresented. He does not say that the cruelties described were committed indiscriminately on the inhabitants of Munster: he simply states that they were inflicted on *the adherents of James Fitzmaurice and the Earl of Desmond.* And by whom were they inflicted? By an army composed, to a large extent, of *Irish Romanists!*[1] The Earl of Ormond was one of those employed to repress the Geraldine rebellion; and if, with his Kernes and Gallowglasses, he spread death and dismay around him,[2] we may be sure that the Earl of Desmond, when he had an opportunity, would not fail to retaliate, with all the vindictiveness of his savage nature, on the men, women, and children in the territory of his hated rival.[3] The cruelties on both sides were not perhaps very unequally distributed. Questions of theology gave very little concern to the belligerents. James

[1] Thus Haverty, speaking of the Geraldine rebellion, says that Sir Wm. Drury, the Lord President of Munster, "summoned all the nobility of Munster, on their allegiance, to rally under the royal standard, and thus gathered a considerable army, *composed to a great extent of Irish and Catholics.*"—*History of Ireland*, p. 416.

[2] *The Annals of the Four Masters* tells us that Ormond at this time joined Sir William Pekham, the Lord Justice, "with an immense host." "Loose marauding parties" were sent into the woods, who "killed blind and feeble men, women, boys and girls, sick persons, idiots, and old people."—O'Donovan's *Annals*, A.D. 1580, vol. v., p. 1731.

[3] The Four Masters relate that, on one occasion, during this war, the rebels nearly depopulated a whole district. "Whole tribes, families, heads of districts, servitors, and soldiers of the territory, were slain."—O'Donovan's *Annals*, A.D. 1582, vol. v., p. 1777. See also Moran's *Archbishops of Dublin*, p. 197.

Fitzmaurice fell by the hand of an Irish Roman Catholic;[1] and the Earl of Desmond himself was captured and killed by his own co-religionists.[2] There are, no doubt, good grounds for believing that the English soldiers—thinking either to strike terror into the natives, or goaded almost to madness by their murders, robberies, and conflagrations—often treated them with horrid inhumanity;[3] but, in such cases, their creed was never taken into consideration. It is absurd, therefore, to speak of the incidents of a civil war, in which Romanists were engaged on both sides, as a "persecution of the Irish Catholics." The controversy was not between Popery and Protestantism, but between rebellion and loyalty.[4]

The following is another specimen of what has been written of the "persecution of the Irish Catholics during the reign of Elizabeth." It professes to describe their condition in 1589:

"All alarm from the Irish chieftains having ceased, the persecution was renewed with all its horrors; *a royal order was promulgated that all should renounce the Catholic faith, yield up the priests*,[5] receive from the heretical ministers the morality and tenets of the Gospel, and assist at their ceremonies on Sundays and holidays; threats, and penalties, *and force* were to be employed *to enforce compliance. . . . . This excited universal alarm throughout the whole island.* The

---

[1] Haverty, p. 416. [2] *Ibid.* p. 431.

[3] At various periods in this reign the soldiers in the service of the Crown often treated the natives with extreme cruelty when putting down rebellion. Of this Mr. Froude has given many instances. See his *History of England*, x., pp. 509-10, 512; xi. 220. But these are examples, not of the persecution of Irish Catholics, but of the punishment of insurgents.

[4] Dr. Moran gives the massacre of Mullaghmast, in 1577, as another illustration of the persecution of Irish Catholics during the reign of Elizabeth. *Archbishops of Dublin*, p. 113. He might as well adduce a late eviction of tenantry in the South of Ireland by a Roman Catholic landlord, as a specimen of the persecution of Irish Catholics during the reign of Victoria. At Mullaghmast the most powerful families on both sides were Roman Catholics. See before, p. 370, *note* (2). See also Haverty, p. 409, *note*. "The eccentric Irish historian Taaffe," says Dr. O'Donovan, "refers this massacre to the reign of Queen Mary, his object having been to show *that religion had nothing to do with it—in which he was right.*"—O'DONOVAN'S *Four Masters*, v. 1696.

[5] The words of the original are "sacerdotes *rejicirent*," that is, *reject* the priests, or cast them off. *Hist. Cath. Iberniae Compendium*, p. 133.

natives *everywhere* refused to be contaminated *by the preaching* and rites of the heretics; sometimes, too, they struck terror into the ministers by night or by day; the ministers, on the other hand, *cited the Catholics before the magistrates*, and had them subjected to imprisonment and fines. Every effort of the Queen and her emissaries was hence directed to despoil the Irish Catholics of their property and *exterminate them*."[1]

It may be sufficient to observe that Ireland never was disturbed by the "royal order" which is here said to have created such "universal alarm." Such an order was quite unknown to the native annalists who have recorded the proceedings of this period, and who certainly would not have failed to register the direful proclamation had it ever been published.[2] The whole story is a very silly and malicious fabrication. Not one-fourth of the parishes of Ireland had now Protestant ministers, and still fewer had Protestant preachers. The people could not be *forced* to attend on services which had not yet been provided. Even the gentry of the Pale were still Papists almost to a man;[3] and persons in authority elsewhere throughout the kingdom regularly attended the celebration of the mass.[4] It is rather difficult to comprehend how

---

[1] O'Sullivan Beare, as quoted by Moran, *Archbishops of Dublin*, p. 117. It is but fair to say that Dr. Moran, in the translation, has considerably aggravated th statements in the original. See *Hist. Cath. Iber. Compendium*, pp. 133, 139. Dublin, 1850.

[2] See O'Donovan's *Annals of the Four Masters*, at A.D. 1589. Though Irish Romanists, writing on the Continent, and *in Latin*, give such startling accounts of these persecutions, it is significant that Irish monks, writing at home and *in Irish*, ignore them altogether. O'Sullivan, the author of the statement commented on in the text, is a very untruthful writer. His falsehoods provoked the spirit of the meek Archbishop Ussher. "In relating matters that fell out in his own time," says the Primate, he "discovereth himself to be as egregious a liar as any, I verily think, that this day breatheth in Christendom."—*Religion of the Ancient Irish and British*, chap. viii., at the end.

[3] Thus, a *Discourse for Ireland*, written about 1594, speaks of "the Papists and malcontents of the English Pale—*under which title almost all the gentlemen there may be comprised.*"—*Carew MSS.*, 1589-1600, p. 106.

[4] Sir John Davys, who was Irish Attorney-General for James I., and who was well acquainted with the history of the country in the reign of Elizabeth, states that Sir John Perrot, who was Viceroy about this period, reduced "the unreformed parts of Ulster into seven shires, namely, Armagh, Monaghan, Tyrone, Coleraine [Derry], Donegal, Fermanagh, and Cavan;" but he adds, "in his time the law

the Protestant clergy, under such circumstances, could "cite the Catholics before the magistrates," and enforce conformity to the established worship. Long after the time indicated by this writer, Elizabeth herself states that, even in the "English Pale, multitudes of parishes were destitute of incumbents and teachers, and in the very great towns of assembly [the assize towns] numbers were not only known to forbear to come to the church or divine service, but *even willingly winked at* to use all manner of popish ceremonies."[1] Her enemies, with a view to foster disaffection to her Government, industriously reported that she designed to exterminate the Irish Catholics; but she met the charge with a spirited and dignified rebuke. "Where it is spread," said the Queen, "that she intendeth the utter extirpation of the Irish, and is offered due obedience and refuseth it, Her Majesty will have it known that no subjects of hers shall be oppressed by any, if they live in obedience; but if any think, by tyrannizing over others, to fashion to themselves any greatness, no formal submission shall preserve them from the rod of her justice."[2]

But perhaps the most impudent vilifier of Elizabeth and her Government is a certain friar, named Dominick O'Daly, or Dominick de Rosario, who, in a well-known production entitled *Persecution after the Geraldines*, has retailed a whole series of barefaced calumnies. O'Daly, who died in 1662 Bishop elect of Coimbria, was a native of Kerry. He appears to have been in some way connected with the Desmond family; and he inherited a spirit of most bitter hostility to

---

was never executed in these new counties by any sheriffs or justices of assize, but the people left to be ruled still by their own barbarous lords and laws."—*Historical Relations*, p. 54. Dublin, 1704.

[1] Instructions by the Queen to the Deputy in Ireland, 18th April, 1597. *Carew MSS.*, 1589-1600, p. 213. "In Ireland the Remonstrants of 1644 (1643?) and 1670 admitted that this Act [of Uniformity] had not been executed at all in this [Elizabeth's] reign."—*Liber Munerum Hiberniae*, vol. i., part i., p. 44. See also Kelly's *Dissertations on Irish Church History*, p. 326. The Remonstrants of 1643 speak of the statute "found among the records of this kingdom of the second year of the reign of the late Queen Elizabeth, *but never executed in her time.*"—See "Remonstrance," dated Trim, 17th March, 1642-3, in Curry's *Historical Memoirs of the Irish Rebellion*, p. 210. Dublin, 1770.

[2] *Carew MSS.*, 1589-1600, p. 121.

England and to Protestantism. His work, written originally in Latin, has been, not long since, translated into English ;[1] and, in a dedication prefixed to it, the reverend editor declares that O'Daly "has written nothing that is not founded on fact."[2] This author resided many years in Portugal, where "he was appointed successively Censor to the Portuguese Inquisition and Inquisitor General."[3] Though he was a persecutor by profession, he has the effrontery to denounce, in the most violent language, the intolerance of the British sovereign. "This far-famed English queen has," says he, "grown drunk on the blood of Christ's martyrs; and, like a tigress, has she hunted down the Irish Catholics; exceeding in ferocity and wanton cruelty the emperors of Pagan Rome.[4] . . . . An Act was passed in the *Irish Parliament*, in the twenty-seventh year of Elizabeth's reign, as virulent as any of those which had emanated from the Parliament of England.[5] . . . . As this Act, passed in the twenty-seventh year of Elizabeth, was the fruitful source of all the penal enactments of James the First and his son Charles, I will have much to say of it in the following pages. At present I must content myself with the extract :—'*Every priest thus taken* is to be adjudged guilty of treason—to be hanged on the gallows—cut down when half-dead—his bowels to be taken out and burned—and his head to be impaled in some conspicuous place—his goods and lands are to be confiscated' . . . . This extract I have transcribed from a narrative of the present persecution, printed in Ireland A.D. 1653."[6]

The penalties of this alleged Act are, no doubt, severe, and abhorrent to the milder spirit of modern Irish legislation; but the reader may perceive that the extract here given enables us to form no idea whatever of the offence which the priest is said to have committed. The quotation is so introduced as to leave the impression that every priest taken up for professing the Roman Catholic religion, is to be consigned

---

[1] By the Rev. C. P. Meehan. Dublin, 1847. [2] P. viii.

[3] *The Irish Writers of the Seventeenth Century*, by Thomas D'Arcy McGee, p. 169. Dublin, 1846.

[4] P. 150. [5] P. 159. [6] P. 160-1.

to this cruel and ignominious fate; but should it appear, on an examination of the context, that it refers to a priest taken in open arms against Elizabeth, or implicated in some plot for her assassination, the extract assumes a quite different aspect.[1] This extract has been quoted from age to age by Roman Catholic writers[2] to illustrate the persecutions of their Irish co-religionists in the reign of Elizabeth; but the whole affair is a delusion. *There is no such Act in the Irish statute-book.* No such enactment was made by the Irish Parliament[3] at any time during the reign of Elizabeth! "Enactments embodying the cruel code that was enforced in England were proposed," says a recent Roman Catholic author, "in 1585;[4] but the Catholic party in Parliament *was successful in its opposition*, and the agents of persecution were never able to palliate their cruelty *by appealing to the Acts of the Irish legislature.*"[5]

---

[1] Strype states that, in 1585, the English Papists were "busy in hatching conspiracies against the Queen's throne and life;" and that in consequence "a severe statute" was enacted "against Jesuits and seminary priests."—*Annals*, vol. iii., part i., p. 425. O'Daly had probably seen an extract from this statute. It has been long quoted, in a garbled form, as an Act of the Irish Parliament.

[2] This imaginary Irish Act is quoted from O'Daly by Burke in his *Hibernia Dominicana*, p. 606; and by Brenan in his *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland*, p. 424. Brenan does not even fairly quote the words of O'Daly. His version of the Act is: "And if from henceforth *any priest shall be detected within these realms*, he shall, *ipso facto*, be guilty of high treason." Cogan, in his *Diocese of Meath* (vol. ii., p. 13. Dublin, 1867), has repeated Brenan's misquotation of O'Daly.

[3] It is to be observed that an Act now passed in England did not, as a matter of course, take effect in Ireland. "Even Poynings' Act, for making *all past statutes* made in England for the public weal of England to be deemed good in Ireland, was an Act of the *Parliament of Ireland*; and all subsequent English statutes were of no force *unless adopted by the Parliament of Ireland.*"—Preface to *Calendar of State Papers relating to Ireland*, James I., 1606-1608. By Russell and Prendergast, p. 73. London, 1874.

[4] The reader will recollect that this is the 27th of Elizabeth, the year when this Act is said to have received the sanction of the Irish Parliament.

[5] Moran's *Archbishops of Dublin*, p. 98. In various works professing to treat of the persecution of Irish Catholics, there is a reference to a set of instructions given to commissioners, or justices of the peace, who were furnished with secret powers for the detection and punishment of Romanists. See *The Geraldines*, by Meehan, pp. 152-3, and appendix. *Hibernia Dominicana*, pp. 607-9; Brenan, p. 424; Moran's *Archbishops of Dublin*, p. 102. Any one who looks at these instructions may easily see that they do not apply to Ireland at all. They were obviously designed to guide officials in carrying out the provisions of an Act of

Elizabeth had many faults; but she had at least some of the qualities of a great princess; and, during her administration, England attained a proud position among the nations of Europe. O'Daly only exhibits his own ignorance and folly when he describes her as "exceeding in ferocity and wanton cruelty the emperors of Pagan Rome."[1] This Dominican friar knew well that prisoners were often confined in the cells of the so-called Holy Office for reading the Scriptures and doubting the pretensions of the Pope; he may have seen the poor victims stretched on the rack; he may have listened to their shrieks of agony when some fresh torture was applied; and yet he was willing to preside over the accursed institute. Such a man was not in a position to denounce the intolerance of others, or to speak of the callous heart of the Queen of England.

The excommunication of Elizabeth, the publication of the bulls calling on the people to rebel, the invasion of the kingdom, and the civil wars which followed, proved fatal to a number of the popish priests and bishops. Two parties now made their appearance among the Irish Romanists. Some, notwithstanding the edicts of Pius V. and Gregory XIII., were quite willing to acknowledge the Queen as their lawful sovereign;[2] others loudly denounced what they called her usurpation, and disowned her authority. The loyal priests—who must have formed a considerable number of the secular clergy[3]—had no reason to fear molestation from Government.[4]

Parliament passed in England. It would have been preposterous at this period to have proposed such instructions for Ireland.

[1] Dr. Moran, the present R.C. Bishop of Ossory, is not ashamed to quote this and other equally outrageous statements made by O'Daly. See his *Archbishops of Dublin*, p 115.

[2] See the Rev. Dr. C. O'Conor's *Historical Address*, part i., p. 19. See also Leland, ii. 306, *note*; and O'Sullivan's *Hist. Cath. Iber. Compendium*, p. 144.

[3] Kelly states that Elizabeth throughout her wars "had the active support of the priests of English extraction."—*Dissertations on Irish Church History*, p. 326.

[4] Even the documents published by writers who profess to treat of the persecution of the Irish Catholics during the reign of Elizabeth illustrate the absurdity of their own statements. Thus the Jesuit Sanders tells of a certain priest named Laurence and several others who were *taken in arms against Elizabeth*, and who, notwithstanding, had the offer "to be restored *to liberty, should they consent to take the oath of allegiance to the Queen.*"—Moran's *Archbishops of Dublin*, p. 203. When they refused, they were put to death, and they are now celebrated as martyrs!

But friars, priests, and prelates who were now sent into the country by the Pope, and who were all believed to be the apostles of treason, were watched with extreme jealousy, and were frequently thrown into prison. We may bewail the infatuation of these men; and yet we cannot but acknowledge their intrepidity and fortitude. Their peculiar theology was as dangerous as it was unscriptural; for they believed that the Pope had a right to depose the Queen; but they maintained it at the peril of their lives. They sacrificed everything on earth, that man holds dear, to their convictions. Their case clearly proves that the truth of a system cannot be established by the earnestness with which it is advocated. Irish Romanists have long since publicly repudiated the doctrine for which these men suffered; and yet they reckon the errorists among the martyrs of their Church. These priests and prelates died—not because they loved the mass and believed in purgatory; for, if they had stopped here, Elizabeth would have connived at their nonconformity,—but because they taught that, as an excommunicated sovereign, she had lost her title to the throne, because they exhorted her subjects to renounce their allegiance, and because they offered them indulgences to induce them to rise in rebellion.

Among those who about this time are reputed to have won the crown of martyrdom is Patrick O'Hely, Roman Catholic Bishop of Mayo. Shortly after the arrival of James Fitzmaurice and the Italians on the coast of Kerry, O'Hely and a friar named Cornelius O'Rourke—both in disguise—stepped on shore from a Spanish vessel at Dingle.[1] They were at once apprehended on suspicion: their real character was soon discovered: it was believed that they came to foster the rebellion: and, after a summary trial, they were consigned to the gibbet.[2] Early in the reign of Elizabeth, by the influence of his friend Wolf, the Papal Nuncio, Richard Creagh had been appointed Roman Catholic Archbishop of Armagh. He was of a respectable family, and a native of Limerick, where he was at one time engaged in mercantile pursuits. He traded with Spain; and, when there on one

[1] Haverty, p. 414. [2] *Ibid.*

occasion, a singular catastrophe awaked him to the importance of religion. The vessel in which he intended to sail left the harbour without him; and, when he hastened to the shore—expecting still to be able to get on board—he was just in time to see the vessel, the crew, and a valuable cargo, sinking beneath the waves. He now resolved to give himself up to the service of the Church: he studied at Louvain: and, on his return to his native city, he set up a school, in the hope of thus advancing the interests of Romanism. In March 1564[1] he was consecrated, in the Italian capital, to the Primacy of Armagh; but, on his way back to Ireland, as he passed through London, he was seized and thrown into prison. After a few weeks, captivity he effected his escape; and he next makes his appearance with Shane O'Neill in Ulster.[2] After a second capture and escape, he was again taken—when he was committed to the Tower and kept there[3] for the rest of his days. He died in 1585. He was evidently regarded by the English Government as a dangerous character: for whilst other Roman Catholic prelates were permitted to remain in Ireland unharmed and at liberty,[4] he received very different treatment.

But, among these reputed martyrs, no one has acquired

---

[1] The silly story of the Nag's Head consecration, repeated by Dr. Renehan, in his *Collections on Irish Church History* (p. 11), is easily refuted. According to it, Creagh was offered large rewards if he would assist at the consecration of Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury. Parker was consecrated in December 1559; Creagh himself was not consecrated until the time mentioned in the text. See Collier's *Ecc. Hist. of Great Britain*, vol. vi., p. 301; Brady's *Irish Reformation*, pp. 37, 38.

[2] Froude, x. 482.

[3] He was an old man when made Primate, and the story that, ten or fifteen years afterwards, if not later, when he had been for years in the Tower, an attempt was made to seduce him into licentiousness by means of the keeper's daughter, is too absurd for credence. It is evidently a stupid repetition of a tale borrowed from the days of Athanasius. The story that he was poisoned in the Tower is alike absurd. According to the current statement he had been there many years, and he probably died of age and infirmity. See Rothe's *De Processu Martyriali Analecta*, pp. 1-47. Coloniae, 1619; King's *Primer*, supplementary volume, pp. 1228-36; Brenan, p. 416; Froude, viii. p. 378; x. 483.

[4] Thus, Leverous, the deposed Bishop of Kildare, in his old age taught a school in Limerick, where he died in 1577, aged eighty. He was buried in the parish church of St. David's. Ware's *Bishops of Kildare*; Brenan, pp. 406-7.

greater celebrity than Dermot O'Hurley, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Cashel. Like Creagh, he was a native of Limerick, where he was born in 1520.[1] He was educated on the continent: he was a successful student: he is said to have delivered public lectures for four years in Louvain; and he was subsequently Professor of Canon Law in Rheims.[2] In the stirring days of Gregory XIII. he repaired to Rome, where he acted as an official of the Inquisition.[3] He appears to have soon recommended himself to the confidence of the Pope: and in September 1580[4]—whilst the Desmond war yet raged—he was advanced to the influential position of Metropolitan of Munster. Some time afterwards he set out for Ireland furnished with letters to the leaders of the rebellion;[5] and much was evidently expected from his well-known ability, energy, and resolution. He contrived to steal into the country in disguise; and for a considerable time[6] he was employed in passing to and fro among the disaffected chieftains: but, in an evil hour, he appeared within the Pale; and ventured to sit down as a guest at the dinner-table of the Baron of Slane at his castle in Meath, along with the Lord Chancellor Dillon.[7] The conversation turned on the great topics of the day: and O'Hurley, who was not in clerical attire, expressed himself in such a way, and exhibited such a knowledge of the popish controversy, as excited the suspicion of the learned judge. A hint was immediately communicated to the authorities in Dublin; and though the Archbishop took the alarm and fled, an active search was instituted, and he was eventually captured. As he was known to be well acquainted with the secrets of the rebels, he was strictly

[1] Renehan's *Collections*, p. 251. Mr. Froude says, on what authority does not appear, that O'Hurley was a native of Kilkenny. *Hist. of England*, xi. 262. Rothe distinctly states that he was born within three miles of the city of Limerick. *De Processu Martyriali Analecta*, p. 48.

[2] Moran's *Archbishops of Dublin*, p. 132; Renehan, p. 253.

[3] Brady's *State Papers*, p. 71.

[4] Brady's *Irish Reformation*, p. 112-3.

[5] *State Papers*, by Brady, p. 71.

[6] According to Dr. Renehan he was two years in the country before he was taken. *Collections*, p. 253. Mr. Froude speaks of the time as much shorter.

[7] O'Sullivan's *Hist. Cath. Ibern. Compendium*. Lib. iv., cap. xix.

examined, and threatened with condign punishment should he refuse to make confession. At first he denied everything; but, when he found that Government had obtained possession of documents by which he was compromised, he reluctantly made some admissions.[1] When he continued to maintain a stubborn silence as to matters of consequence respecting which information was desiderated, he was subjected to cruel suffering. In the hope of obtaining important revelations, he was put to the torture by "toasting his feet against the fire with hot boots."[2] He now made some further disclosures: but, as he still remained reticent on certain points of interest, the Lord Justices did not well know how to dispose of their prisoner. The Dublin lawyers, who are supposed to have been secretly on his side, gave it as their opinion that he could not be convicted under any existing statute, for the treasons which could be proved against him had been committed abroad;[3] and, in the present state of public feeling, it was deemed unwise to submit a doubtful issue to the decision of an Irish jury.[4] As it was considered that it would not be conducive to the public safety to set such a man at liberty, another mode of trial was adopted; and the unfortunate O'Hurley, in July 1584, was hanged by sentence of a court martial.[5]

Throughout this prosecution, Loftus, Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, appears to singular disadvantage. He was exceedingly fond of power: and he repeatedly acted as one of the Lord Justices who, in the absence of the Viceroy, administered the government of Ireland. As a ruler, he was harsh and unscrupulous. He happened to be in office when O'Hurley was made prisoner; and his treatment of the Roman Catholic dignitary has brought down on him deserved odium. The old Inquisitor could not consistently complain when he was put to the rack that he might be compelled to

---

[1] *State Papers*, by Brady, pp. 71, 74.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 74. Roman Catholic writers have added various details of suffering. Their statements are probably not without some foundation, but they are apparently exaggerated.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 75. Mr. Froude states that these lawyers were themselves Catholics. *Hist. of England*, xi. 263-4.

[4] *State Papers*, by Brady, p. 75.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 84.

divulge the history of his treasons; for he had himself been connected with an institute which had long systematically employed such a method of procedure: but the application of torture, for the purpose of wringing confessions from a prisoner, is abhorrent to humanity and justice; and the Protestant prelate greatly discredited his position when he sanctioned such barbarity. By this sad affair his own Church was compromised and injured. O'Hurley believed that he was doing God service, when, as the minion of the Pope, he was seeking to overthrow the English power in Ireland. But, if he chose to act as a conspirator, he had no right to expect immunity; and, if he terminated his career on the gallows, he only paid the penalty awarded to him by the law of nations. It is absurd to speak of him as a martyr for religion. He was put to death, not for being a Romanist, but for being a traitor. And yet Loftus placed himself in a completely false position by the part which he acted on this occasion. It was most unbecoming for him to assume the office of Inquisitor; and to attempt to force O'Hurley, by appliances of horrid cruelty, to reveal his accomplices. The prisoner was the minister of a Church to which almost all his countrymen still belonged: he was recognized by them as a high ecclesiastical dignitary: and nothing was more fitted to rouse their deepest indignation, and to inspire them with a deadly antipathy to the Reformed Faith, than to see him tortured and put to death by command of a Protestant Archbishop. "The servant of the Lord must not strive, but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient, in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves, if God, peradventure, will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth:"[1] and Loftus was entirely forgetful of his proper vocation when he was ordering men to be half roasted, or when he was superintending the execution of criminals. Protestantism could not prosper when it had such forbidding representatives. The sword of justice is out of place in the hand of the Christian pastor. The evil of permitting the clergy to hold high civil appointments was here exhibited in its most odious

[1] 2 Tim. ii. 24, 25.

form; and yet till our own age this anomaly has been perpetuated.

Though Archbishop Loftus was deemed an able preacher, he seems, as he advanced in life, to have lost confidence in the power of the pulpit. His own ministrations do not appear to have proved mighty to the pulling down of strongholds. Towards the close of the reign of Elizabeth he did not scruple to recommend compulsion in matters of religion. "I assure your Lordship," says he in one of his letters to Burghley, "unless they (the Irish) be forced, they will not ever come to hear the Word preached. . . . It is almost a bootless labour for any man to preach in the country out of Dublin, for want of hearers— . . . . . .

. . . . . .

but, in mine opinion, this may be easily remedied + if the Ecclesiastical Commission + be put in use. If liberty be left to myself + + *to imprison and fine* all such as are obstinate and disobedient, and if they persist—being men of ability to bear their own charges—to send them into England for example sake, I have no doubt but within a short time they will be reduced to good conformity. . . . This course of reformation, the sooner it is begun the better it will prosper, and the longer it is deferred, the more dangerous it will be."[1] Had Loftus all along remembered that the weapons of the pastor's warfare are not carnal; had he given himself entirely to his spiritual duties; had he sought by kindness, by self-denial, by the charity that never faileth, and by the manifestation of the truth, to commend himself to the Irish people; he would not have had reason to complain, after he had been about thirty years in the country, that nothing short of force could induce them to attend the Protestant worship. But the course habitually pursued by this covetous and proud prelate was only fitted to inspire earnest Romanists with an antipathy to the services of the Reformed Church.

Immediately after the execution of Archbishop O'Hurley, Sir John Perrot became Lord Deputy of Ireland. The new Viceroy, though greatly deficient in command of temper, was

[1] *State Papers*, by Brady, pp. 127, 128. This letter is dated September 22nd, 1590.

a bold, well meaning, and able governor; and the general sorrow awakened by his departure from Dublin after he had for some years administered the affairs of the country,[1] evinced the firm hold he had obtained on the affections of the people. But he entered on his government determined to put down rebellion; and, believing that the so-called religious orders were the great fomenters of disloyalty, he resolved to give them no encouragement. In a paper drawn up by command of Her Majesty, and submitted to her some time before he arrived in Ireland, he proposes that "friars, monks, Jesuits, *pardoners*,[2] nuns, and such like, that openly seek the maintenance of papacy, a traitorous kind of people, the bellows to blow the coals of all mischief and rebellion, and fit spies of Antichrist, whose kingdom they greedily expect to be restored, *be executed by martial law*."[3] He did not mean that they were to be put to death without trial; but he had little confidence in the verdicts of Irish juries when such parties were concerned; and, as he was a soldier himself, he considered that in cases of this description, justice could be more efficiently administered by means of military tribunals.[4] During the time of his government he tolerated loyal priests, and permitted Romanists to celebrate the rites of their religion without molestation. This lenity gave much offence to Loftus, who complains that "recusancy," properly so called, began in the second year of his vice-royalty.[5]

---

[1] See Dr. C. O'Conor's *Historical Address*, part i., p. 18, *note*.

[2] By *Pardoners* are meant the clergy who stirred up the people to rebellion by pressing on them the Papal Indulgences or *Pardons*. Here, as so often elsewhere, Dr. Moran has misquoted the original. In addition to various other liberties taken with the passage given in the text, he has substituted "*Priests*" for "Pardoners." See his *Archbishops of Dublin*, p. 111. Dublin, 1864. There is no evidence that Perrot ever proposed to have the ordinary parish priests tried by Court Martial.

[3] *The Government of Ireland, under the Honourable, Just, and Wise Governor Sir John Perrot, Knight.* Item 7 of his *Proposals to the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty.* London, 1626.

[4] It is but fair to state that the Queen did not accede to his proposal.

[5] *i.e.* in 1585. In 1587 a Synod was held in the diocese of Clogher at which were present seven Roman Catholic prelates, viz., the Bishops of Derry, Raphoe, Down and Connor, Ardagh, Kilmore, Clogher, and Achonry. "They published there, *before a large number of the clergy*, the Council of Trent."—RENEHAN'S

Before that time, he tells us, "there were not in the Pale the number of twelve recusants, gentlemen of account. . . . . Before that time they were restrained by the Ecclesiastical Commission, and howsoever they were affected inwardly in their consciences, yet outwardly they showed great duty and obedience in resorting to service, sermons, and in receiving of the communion. . . . Sir Nicholas White, in the name of his countrymen, moved Sir John Perrot . . . to permit this people to have the liberty of their consciences and the free use of their religion. . . . When we, the Bishops of Dublin, Meath, and a few others well affected, perceived this declination, being authorised by Her Majesty's High Commission for Ecclesiastical Causes, we convented before us the principal gentlemen and such as we knew to be ringleaders in this cause, seeking to draw them to better conformity. But so soon as they came before us, we were forbidden by the then Lord Deputy to deal with them, who told us . . . . that he had received direction from their Lordships (the English Privy Council) that this people *should not be dealt with for matters of religion.* And so we were restrained from proceeding any further. And presently it was bruited throughout the Pale, that Her Majesty's pleasure was *that they should not be touched for their religion,* but should be permitted to use the same at their pleasure—*and so they did during the time of Sir John's government*, wherein they took such heart and grew to such obstinacy that now they can hardly be reclaimed." [1]

It appears from this that the Protestant prelates—who were the principal members of Her Majesty's High Commission for Ecclesiastical Causes—took the lead in pressing the Act of Uniformity. They would have displayed better taste, as well as sounder judgment, had they remained in the back-

---

Collections, p. 435. The members of the Synod do not appear to have anticipated any disturbance. See also Renehan, p. 139, *note*. The prelates who sat in this Synod are styled :—Redmundus Derrensis ; Donaldus Rapotensis ; Cornelius Dunensis et Connorensis ; Edmundus Ardaghadensis ; Richardus Kilmorensis ; Cornelius Clogherensis ; Eugenius Aghadensis." See *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* for December, 1866. p. 147. See also pp. 380 and 381 of this volume.

[1] "Loftus to Burghley," September 22nd, 1590. *State Papers* by Brady, pp. 125, 126.

ground. Men cannot be induced to change their principles by the discipline of pains and penalties; and the bishops should have relied on the more excellent way of holy living, diligent catechizing, and laborious preaching. Whilst Loftus was complaining of Sir John Perrot because he could not obtain his assistance as a persecutor, he refused to assist the Viceroy in his endeavours to promote a scheme really fitted to elevate the condition of the country. As early as the fourteenth century an Irish University had been partially organized; and at a subsequent date, when the institute had fallen into decay, an effort had been made for its reconstruction.[1] Such however was the unhappy state of public affairs that the project proved abortive. Sir Henry Sidney, in the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth, had recommended the design;[2] and in 1579 Clonfert had been proposed as the site of the seminary.[3] When Sir John Perrot was entrusted with the Viceroyalty, there was, we are told, "precisely given him in charge the erection of an University in Dublin."[4] But he was at once confronted by the opposition of the Leinster Primate. As there were two cathedrals in Dublin, government deemed one of them unnecessary. In a communication to Perrot the Queen suggested the suppression of St. Patrick's, and the appropriation of its revenues to the endowment of the new college. Loftus vehemently resisted the proposal. He was deeply interested in the benefices and other estates of the cathedral, granted by long leases to himself, his children, and more distant relatives.[5] But he dared not avow the ignoble motives by which he was actuated. He pretended zeal for the Church, and affirmed that the revenues

---

[1] See before, pp. 524-525.

[2] Leland, ii. 323; Campion's *History*, p. 196. Dublin, 1809.

[3] See *Calendar of Patent and Close Rolls of Chancery in Ireland*, by Morrin, vol. ii., p. 22.

[4] *The Government of Ireland under Sir John Perrot*, p. 6.

[5] Mant, i. 311. Elrington states that he "had notoriously alienated to his family the revenues of two prebends and had got a valuable lease from his brother-in-law, the Dean of St. Patrick's. These spoils would certainly have been wrested from him, had an inquiry been made into the revenues of the Cathedral before they were transferred to the new Colleges."—*Life of Ussher*, p. 6, *note*. Perrot had proposed the erection of two Universities. *Ibid.*

of St. Patrick's were necessary for the sustenance of the few learned ministers then in the island.[1] It required some effrontery to produce such an argument, as the Deanery had for years been held by a layman; and Loftus himself had, not long before, promoted another layman to the archdeaconry of Glendalough.[2] The Primate had a strong dislike to home education if it interfered with his domestic interests. He could not at all understand why Irishmen should find it inconvenient to attend a British University. The vessels of the sixteenth century did not always pass safely and speedily across the Channel; and yet the Archbishop urged that all reasonable men might be well contented with the Colleges of England. "Oxford and Cambridge," said he peevishly, "are not far off—all under our dominion—*but this will not satisfy.*"[3] When he saw that Perrot could not be duped by such special pleading, and that he continued to urge the adoption of his scheme, he still refused to yield; quarrelled with the Viceroy; and in a fit of affected indignation, threatened to resign his archbishopric![4] At length, by browbeating and intrigue, he so far prevailed that the plan of appropriating the revenues of St. Patrick's was abandoned.

Loftus, however, soon saw that the demand for a University could not be resisted. When he discovered that the Queen was not to be diverted from her purpose, he resolved to make a virtue of necessity, and to take the lead in the undertaking. He accordingly turned his attention to a plot of ground at Hoggin Green, a place in the vicinity of Dublin. Immediately before the English invasion, Dermod McMurrough, King of Leinster, had built there a monastery[5] which soon obtained celebrity; it was richly endowed: and, until the time of the dissolution of the abbeys in the reign of Henry VIII., its Prior

---

[1] See his letter to Burghley in *State Papers*, by Brady, p. 95.

[2] Mant, i. 287; Brady's *English State Church in Ireland*, pp. 49, 50. Ball, the Lay Archdeacon of Glendalough, was nephew to Weston, the Lay Dean of St. Patrick's. Though a layman, and very immoral, this Ball had other ecclesiastical appointments heaped on him by the Archbishop. *Ibid.*

[3] Loftus to Burghley. *State Papers*, by Brady, p. 95.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 96.

[5] See before, p. 242, *note* (2).

had a seat in the Irish Parliament.[1] The buildings were in a ruinous condition; but it occurred to the Archbishop that the tenement would supply a suitable site for the intended College: and, as it now belonged to the city Corporation, he hoped to have little difficulty in inducing them to part with it for the promotion of a scheme which was popular in Dublin. He was vain of his rhetorical ability; and he seized the opportunity for making no less than two orations in the city Hall.[2] In a speech of great length delivered on one of these occasions, in the spring of 1591, and addressed to the Mayor and Common Council, he pointed out to them "how advantageous it would be to have a nursery of learning" among them, and "how kindly her Majesty would take it, if they would bestow that old decayed monastery of All-Hallows, which her father, King Henry the Eighth, had, at the dissolution of the abbeys, given them, for erecting such a structure."[3] "The creating of a College," said he, "will not only be a means of civilizing the nation, and of enriching this city, but your children, by their birth in this place, will so, as it were, fall opportunely into the lap of the Muses, and you need not hazard them abroad for the acquiring of foreign accomplishments, having a well-endowed University at your doors."[4] The Corporation assented to his application;[5] and thus the monastery with the lands adjoining—then estimated to be worth £20 a year, equivalent to about £160 of our present currency—became the property of the College. The Queen, on the 3rd of March, 1592, granted a Charter to the new Institute.

It appears from this instrument[6] that the establishment was

[1] See Ware's *Annals*, p. 100. *Works*. Dublin, 1705.

[2] Heron's *Constitutional History of the University of Dublin*, p. 12. Dublin, 1847. The second speech was delivered when the Queen's letter arrived approving of the site. He then returned thanks in the name *of the clergy*, and of Her Majesty, to the Corporation for their gift. See Ware's *Annals*, A.D. 1590.

[3] Mant, i. 317.

[4] Heron, p. 13.

[5] There is reason to believe that, at this time, a number of the members of the Corporation were Romanists. About thirteen years after this date, sixteen aldermen and citizens were summoned before the Privy Council as Papists, and nine were fined and imprisoned. Heron, p. 29, *note*.

[6] It may be found at length in Heron's *Constitutional History of the University of Dublin*, pp. 14-21. See also *Calendar of the Patent and Close Rolls of Chancery in Ireland*, by Morrin, ii. 345.

designed to be a national seminary. The Queen doubtless expected that it would provide collegiate training for persons going forward to the ministry in the Established Church ;[1] but its doors were to be open to all classes of the Irish people. Her Majesty states in the charter that it was intended for the benefit of "the youth of the Kingdom ;" and that it was to be "a College, the mother of an University, for the education, training, and instruction of students in arts and faculties." It was to be designated "The College of the Holy and Undivided Trinity, *near Dublin*,[2] founded by Queen Elizabeth ;" and was to be furnished with a Provost, Fellows, and Scholars. On the death of the Provost, the Fellows, or the majority of them, were permitted to elect a successor. The Provost and Fellows were from time to time, "to make, constitute, and confirm laws, statutes, and ordinances" for its government. The word Protestant does not occur in the document :[3] but the Archbishop of Dublin and the Bishop of Meath were to be among the visitors who formed a court of appeal, in cases where the Provost and Fellows were unable to come to a satisfactory determination ; and it is expressly declared that the Seminary was intended to promote "the cultivation of virtue *and religion*," as well as "the acquirement of learning."

The funds necessary for the erection of the buildings were raised by public subscription. A very few days after the execution of the charter, the Lord Deputy and Council issued a circular urging a collection in every barony, and suggesting that a book should be provided in which were to be entered

---

[1] It is stated that, when the College was established, "*on Saturday*, in the afternoon, each tutor read, in Latin, a lecture in divinity to his pupils."—Elrington's *Life of Ussher*, p. 7.

[2] Heron describes the place as "a certain marsh, called in Saxon language Hoggin Green, adjacent to Dublin city, on the seaward side."—*Constitutional History*, p. 3.

[3] But there can be no doubt that it was intended to promote the progress of Protestantism. The Queen states in a letter to the Lord Deputy, dated 29th of December, 1591, that it "was to serve for a college for learning, whereby knowledge and civility might be increased by the instruction of our people there, whereof many have usually heretofore used to travel into France, Italy and Spain, to get learning in such foreign universities, where they have been *infected with Popery* and other ill qualities, and so become evil subjects."—*Calendar of the Patent and Close Rolls of Chancery in Ireland*, by Morrin, ii. 227.

the names of all who could afford any contribution.[1] Though the country was in deep poverty, there was a prompt and generous response to this appeal. The citizens of Dublin, without respect to creed, testified their interest in the undertaking by handsome donations.[2] Sir Richard Bingham collected £200 in County Galway. The freeholders of Cork agreed to contribute according to a fixed scale.[3] A sum exceeding £2,000—equal to about eight times that amount of our money—was soon forthcoming.[4] Though Protestants were, in all likelihood, the largest donors, Roman Catholics did not withhold their benefactions.[5] The building was at once commenced, and carried on with great activity. Providence seemed to bless the enterprise. "Josephus reports," says Fuller in his own quaint fashion, "that during the time of the building of the temple, it rained not in the day time, but in the night—that the showers might not hinder the work. I say what by him is reported, hath been avouched to me by witnesses without exception, that the same happened here, from the founding to the finishing of this College—the officious heavens always smiling by day, though often weeping by night, till the work was completed."[6] On the 13th of March, 1592, Thomas Smith, Mayor of Dublin, laid the foundation stone of the University; and all the arrangements were soon in such a state of forwardness that on the 9th of January, 1594,[7]

[1] See the *Dublin University Calendar* for 1833. Introduction, pp. 29-31.

[2] Heron's *Constitutional History*, pp. 22, 29. [3] *Ibid.* p. 23.

[4] Taylor's *History of the University of Dublin*, pp. 213–4. London, 1845.

[5] "Sir William Fitzwilliams, Lord Deputy of Ireland, whose arms are deservedly graven over the College gate, issued out his letters for collection to all the counties in Ireland to advance so good a design; and the Irish, *though then generally Papists*, were very bountiful thereunto."—FULLER'S *Church History of Britain*, iii. 122. London, 1837.

[6] *Church History of Britain*, iii. 123. Fuller was born only fourteen years after the building of the College. It is stated in the *Annals of the Four Masters* that, in 1575, "there was no rain for one hour, *by night or day*, from Bealtaine to Lammas," *i.e.* from the 1st of May to the 1st of August.—O'DONOVAN'S *Annals*, v. 1681.

[7] Elrington's *Life of Ussher*, p. 5. Many writers, not remembering that the year then commenced on the 25th of March, give the date 1593. This blunder is committed even in the "History of the College," given in the *University Calendar!* See the *Dublin University Calendar* for 1833, p. 33.

students began to be admitted. James Ussher, afterwards Archbishop of Armagh,—so famous as a theologian and an antiquary—was one of the first enrolled.

According to the charter, the College was "composed of one Provost and of three Fellows in the name of more, and of three scholars in the name of more." Loftus, Archbishop of Dublin, was nominated the first Provost; and with him were associated as Fellows, Henry Ussher, Lucas Challoner, and Lancelott Monie.[1] These appointments were but honorary; and were only to continue until suitable Professors could be found. Walter Travers, an eminent Presbyterian minister, was chosen as the first regular Provost. The selection of such a man to preside over the Seminary attests that it started on its career in no spirit of exclusive sectarianism. The theological principles of Travers were well known.[2] He was so averse to the episcopal regimen that he travelled over into Holland to receive ordination from a Dutch presbytery. He had officiated for some time in the Temple Church, London, where he could preach without subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles;[3] and where he had no less distinguished a colleague than Richard Hooker, the author of the celebrated treatise on *Ecclesiastical Polity*. Hooker and Travers were closely allied by marriage ties; and both were possessed of superior talents; but their sentiments were irreconcileable; and they could not agree to differ. "Mr. Travers's utterance," says Fuller, "was graceful; gesture, plausible; matter, profitable; and his style carried in it *indolem pietatis* 'a genius of grace' flowing from his sanctified heart. Some say that the congregation in the Temple ebbed in the forenoon, and flowed in the afternoon; and that the auditory of Mr. Travers was far the more numerous—the first occasion of emulation between them. . . . Here might one on Sunday have seen almost as many writers as hearers, not only young stu-

[1] Henry Ussher was now Archdeacon of Dublin, and afterwards Archbishop of Armagh. He was uncle to the more celebrated Primate, James Ussher. Luke Challoner was one of the Prebendaries of St. Patrick's; and Monie was one of the Prebendaries of Christ Church.

[2] See Elrington's *Life of Ussher*, pp. 15, 16.

[3] Fuller, iii. 126.

dents, but even the gravest benchers—such as Sir Edward Coke and Sir James Altham then were—were not more exact in taking instructions from their clients, than in writing notes from the mouths of their ministers. The worst was, these two preachers . . . clashed one against another, so that what Hooker delivered in the forenoon, Mr. Travers confuted in the afternoon. At the building of Solomon's Temple, neither hammer, nor axe, nor tool of iron, was heard therein: whereas alas! in this Temple not only much knocking was heard, but—which was the worst—the nails and pins which one master builder drave in, were driven out by the other."[1]

One Lord's day, as Travers was about to ascend the pulpit stairs of the Temple Church, a messenger from Archbishop Whitgift appeared, and served him with an inhibition. He was abruptly forbidden by the English Primate to preach either there or elsewhere. The congregation—obliged to disperse without a sermon—complained bitterly of this curt and arbitrary exercise of ecclesiastical authority: but remonstrance was unavailing. Travers had, however, powerful friends; and, among the rest, the Lord Treasurer, Burleigh, with whom he resided in the capacity of domestic chaplain.[2] Through his influence he was made Provost of Trinity College, Dublin—for Burleigh, in the Charter, was appointed first Chancellor of the New University. Two of the first regular Fellows—James Fullarton and James Hamilton—were also Presbyterians.[3] Some time before, these gentlemen had been sent over to the Irish Capital, as political agents, by King James of Scotland; and meanwhile, to save appearances, they taught there a few select pupils.[4] Under their care young Ussher—the future Primate of Armagh—received his

[1] Fuller, iii. 128.

[2] *Ibid.* iii. 126.

[3] Both were subsequently knighted, and Hamilton became the first Lord Claneboy. Both afterwards became conformists.

[4] When Archbishop Ussher, in after life, "recounted the providences of God towards himself, he would usually say that he took this for one remarkable instance of it, that he had the opportunity and advantage of his education from these men who came thither by chance, and yet proved so happily useful to himself and others."—ELRINGTON'S *Life of Ussher*, p. 4. James Hamilton was his tutor in college, as well as at school.

early education. In 1598—when Travers retired from the office of Provost [1]—the place for some time remained vacant: but, in 1601, Henry Alvey, a man of the same religious principles, was chosen to preside over the Seminary.[2] These facts demonstrate that exact conformity to the established ritual was not required from those originally appointed to impart instruction in the Irish University.

It was not to be expected that the more zealous adherents of the sovereign Pontiff would be satisfied with this new seat of learning. All its teachers were decided Protestants; and the collegiate course was fitted to promote the progress of enlightened religious sentiment. Lukewarm Romanists—half inclined to conformity—might attend;[3] but it was not a place where candidates for the ministry of the Papal Church could be instructed. The great mass of the Romish clergy in Ireland had long been extremely ignorant: many of them were grossly immoral; and it was obvious that, if their Church was to maintain its ground in the country, it must be furnished with a more intelligent and reputable priesthood. Attempts had been already made to promote the improvement of its ministry; and the subject was deemed of so much consequence, that it had been brought under the notice of more than one of the Roman Catholic Kings of the Continent. Philip II and the Pope encouraged projects for the education of Irish students abroad; and seminaries, where young Hibernians were prepared for the service of their native Church, soon made their appearance in Portugal, Spain, and the Low Countries. Thomas White, a native of Clonmel, is said to have been the means of originating an Irish College at Salamanca as early as 1582;[4] and Baron George Sylveria—a native

[1] At first the chief and almost the only support of the College was derived from lands in Ulster; and these, on the breaking out of Tyrone's rebellion, yielded no revenue. *Dublin University Calendar* for 1833. Introd. p. 34. Travers, about this time, resigned the Provostship.

[2] Reid's *Hist. of the Presb. Church in Ire'and*, i. 59. Belfast, 1867.

[3] Phelan quotes a writer of the year 1614 who alleges that Sir Patrick Barnwell, who had then risen into seditious notoriety, was "the first person of quality that had ever been sent out of Ireland to be brought up in learning beyond the seas."—*Remains*, ii. 346, *note*. This, of course, refers to the laity.

[4] Anderson's *Sketches of the Native Irish*, p. 70; Brenan, p. 423.

of Portugal, but maternally of Irish descent[1]—is reported to have founded another institute of the same description at Alcala in 1590.[2] The Irish Seminary at Lisbon was erected and endowed in 1595.[3] The Irish College of Douay in Flanders was founded in the following year.[4] Christopher Cusack, a priest of the diocese of Meath, exerted himself much in promoting the establishment of this and similar places of instruction in France and the Netherlands.[5] The Irish College on the hill of St. Geneviève in Paris appears to have been a gift of the French Government.[6] In this way a supply of priests—with all their native prejudices against England cherished and aggravated—was provided for unhappy Ireland.

When Dublin College was beginning to supply a liberal education to the youth of the country, and these other seminaries were making their appearance on the continent, the island was still agitated by internal discord. Hugh O'Neill—son of Matthew of Dungannon, who was an illegitimate son of Con[7]—was now the most powerful among the Irish chiefs; and, though meditating treason, he contrived to act in such a way that, for a long time, he excited no alarm. In the wars with the Earl of Desmond he took the side of the Government, and had been entrusted with the command of a troop of horse. Though he professed to be a Romanist, he did not seem to be very devotedly attached to his Church—as, when in Dublin, he did not scruple to conform to the established worship.[8] He had enjoyed the advantages of an English education, and he was recommended by a most insinuating address. He had secured so completely the confidence of Elizabeth that she, in the first instance, confirmed to him the forfeited title of Earl of Tyrone; and then bestowed on him, free of rent, the vast possessions claimed by his family. When in the English

[1] His mother is said to have been a Macdonnel from the North of Ireland.

[2] Anderson's *Sketches of the Native Irish*, p. 70. According to Brenan this College was not founded till 1599.

[3] Brenan, p. 423. [4] *Ibid. l. c.* [5] *Ibid. l. c.*

[6] *Ibid. l. c.* [7] See Leland, ii. 222-3.

[8] See Phelan's *Remains*, ii. 224. In 1590 he solemnly pledged himself to the Queen "that he maintain not wittingly in his country any monk, friar, nun, or priest, *that shall not conform themselves to the religion now established.*"—*Carew MSS.*, 1589-1600, p. 38.

service he had applied himself diligently to the study of the art of war; and he soon exhibited superior military genius. For a time he seemed to hesitate between loyalty and rebellion: but eventually his ambition overcame his prudence; and, calculating on aid from abroad, he resolved to assert his independence as Prince of Ulster. In 1588 he first awakened the suspicions of the ministers of Elizabeth. In that year several of the ships belonging to the great Spanish Armada were wrecked on the coast of the North of Ireland; and some of the officers on board, who came in contact with O'Neill, were treated by him with marked kindness. It was believed that he entered into confidential intercourse with these foreigners; disclosed to them his designs; and urged them, on their return home, to recommend King Philip to assist him in his enterprise. In due time clear proofs of his guilt found their way into the hands of the English Council:[1] but the Earl of Tyrone continued to equivocate, and protested his fidelity.

O'Neill was long employed in drilling troops and collecting military stores, before he ventured openly to raise the standard of rebellion. Some successes he achieved soon after he appeared in arms against the Government, greatly exalted his warlike reputation. In a battle fought in August 1598, near the fort of Blackwater,[2] with an equal force opposed to him led by an able commander, the English met with one of the most signal discomfitures they had sustained in Ireland since the days of Henry II. O'Neill now proclaimed himself the champion of Romanism; denounced the Queen as a heretic; avowed his determination to extirpate Protestantism;[3] and called on all good Catholics to give him their support. This appeal met with only a partial response—as a considerable number of those who adhered to the old worship either refused to join him,

---

[1] *Ibid.* 1589-1600, p. 122, 123.

[2] At a place called *Beal-an-atha-buy*, *i.e.* the mouth of the Yellow Ford.

[3] Leland, ii. 364-7. In November 1599, O'Neill published a manifesto in which he declared that he would employ himself, to the utmost of his power, "for the *extirpation* of *heresy*." See this manifesto in Leland, ii. 364-367; and Phelan's *Remains*, ii. 229-233. The meaning of this declaration made by O'Neill at the head of a victorious army could not be misunderstood.

or were found among the soldiers of Elizabeth.[1] But he secured extensive co-operation; and seriously menaced the stability of the British power in Ireland. The Pope came to his aid; presented him with a consecrated plume—which he gravely declared to be the feathers of the phoenix;[2] and, as on a former occasion, granted himself and all his confederates the indulgences conferred on those who fought against the Turks for the recovery of the Holy Land.[3] The King of Spain sent him supplies of troops, arms, and ammunition. In September 1601, three or four thousand Spanish soldiers, under the command of Don Juan de Aquila, landed at Kinsale to aid the insurgents. But the steady valour of the English, commanded by Lord Mountjoy, at length reduced the proud chieftain to such difficulties that he was compelled to sue for mercy. He had barely completed his submission, when tidings arrived of the death of Elizabeth—who closed her earthly career on the 24th of March, 1603.

The announcement of the approach of the great Spanish Armada to the British shores must have inspired the earnest professors of the reformed faith with deep anxiety; for they knew well that, should the expedition prove successful, Protestantism was doomed to perish in the fires of martyrdom. Its extinction was the avowed object of the armament. When Providence, by the agency of the winds and waves, defeated the enterprise, the power of Elizabeth was greatly strengthened; and she was in a position to deal firmly with traitors at home who were plotting the subversion of her government. But though Romanists were required by law to be present at the established worship, she was disposed to overlook the absence of loyal non-conformists: and, though she was often accused of persecution, she stoutly denied the charge. A proclamation issued by her in October 1591, against the entrance of Jesuits and Seminary Priests into the kingdom, clearly

---

[1] See Macgeoghegan's *History of Ireland*, p. 488, where there is an account of the old Irish and Anglo-Irish who supported the Queen.

[2] O'Sullivan's *Hist. Cath. Iber. Compend.* Lib. v. c. 12.; Haverty, p. 474; Leland, ii. 364.

[3] Leland, ii. 368; Haverty, p. 474. See this Bull of Pope Clement VIII. in King's *Primer*, supplementary volume, 1286. It is dated 18th April, 1600.

enunciates the principles on which she professed to administer her government. "We have saved our Kingdoms," said the Queen in this manifesto, "by the efficacy of the laws enacted against rebels, and those guilty of high treason, and *not against religion*, as has been falsely advanced by the favourers of these base views; which is the more flagrant (evident) from criminal suits having been instituted, in which none were condemned or put to death *except for treason*, and for their avowal, *that they would aid and assist the Pope and his army if sent to invade our realms.* It is a matter also of notoriety that *none of our subjects have been put to death for their religion*, inasmuch as many possessed of riches, and professing a contrary belief to ours, are punished neither in their properties, their lives, nor their freedom, and are subject only to pay a certain fine for their refusal to frequent our churches—which is on our part a clear refutation of the aspersions and calumnies that have been propagated in foreign countries by those who have fled from their own."[1] The Queen would not have ventured to put forth such statements in the face of Europe, in relation to her Roman Catholic subjects,[2] had they been easily capable of contradiction.

When Hugh O'Neill raised the standard of rebellion, he demanded "liberty of conscience" as a condition of his return to allegiance.[3] Such a claim was then scarcely known in Ireland;[4] and, though most reasonable in itself, it came rather awkwardly from the northern dynast, as he had no special

---

[1] Macgeoghegan's *History of Ireland*, p. 494. See also the *Geraldines*, by Meehan, pp. 144-48; and Burke's *Hibernia Dominicana*, pp. 603-6.

[2] It must be admitted that, in relation to loyal *Protestant* non-conformists, these statements were quite incorrect. The English Protestant sectaries complained, and often with good reason, that Elizabeth was disposed to be less favourable to them than to the Romanists.

[3] *Carew MSS.*, 1589-1600, p. 133.

[4] "Never before had this free exercise of religion been punished or inquired after." Moryson, quoted by Moore in his *History of Ireland*, vol. iv., p. 108. In like manner Ware says that the "free exercise of religion" . . . . "as yet never had been punished, *or so much as inquired into.*"—*Annals*, A.D. 1595. "That such was the case in Ireland," says the Roman Catholic Moore, "*there can be no doubt;* although by most Catholic historians, the wars of Ireland, during this reign, have been represented as having originated almost solely in religious differences."—*Hist. of Ireland*, iv. 108.

cause to complain of interference with his religious freedom. Liberty of conscience at that time was a phrase of rather doubtful significance; for it might mean liberty to obey the Pope rather than the Queen. Elizabeth regarded the demand as tantamount to a proposal to encourage rebellion. "He may be sharply told," said she in reply, "that this hath been a later disloyal compact [or proposition] made betwixt him and others of the rebels *without any reasonable ground or cause to move them thereunto,* especially considering *there hath been no proceeding against any of them* to move so unreasonable and disloyal a request."[1] The Queen was resolved not to alter existing laws; but, though the Act of Uniformity was to be found in the statute-book, it had not been enforced among the Irish chieftains. "Liberty of conscience"—though sounding so strangely in the mouth of a Romanist—soon became a popular party-cry of the disaffected. O'Neill laboured to induce all his countrymen to join him by representing his rebellion as a war of religion. At a subsequent stage of the contest he "preyed, burnt, and spoiled" the lands of Lord Barry, an influential Roman Catholic peer who refused him his support; and at the same time addressed to him a letter upbraiding him for his want of piety and patriotism. "You separated yourself," said he, in this epistle, "from the unity of Christ's mystical body, the Catholic Church. . . . You are the cause why all the nobility of the South—from the East part to the West—you being linked unto each one of them, either in affinity or consanguinity, are not linked together to shake off the cruel yoke of heresy and tyranny, with which our souls and bodies are oppressed."[2] Lord Barry returned a bold reply, declaring that he had not been deprived of his religious liberty,[3] and intimating pretty plainly that the Pope

[1] *Carew MSS.*, 1589-1600, p. 167.

[2] *Pacata Hibernia*, p. 36. Dublin, 1820.

[3] During the administration of the Earl of Essex, who became Lord Lieutenant of Ireland in 1599, the Roman Catholics were allowed "to celebrate mass *publicly* in chapels, or other houses, but *not in parish churches.* . . . When the [Roman] Catholic Mayor of Waterford escorted him to the church door, but respectfully declined going farther, the Earl observed that it *was no part of his business to inquire into men's consciences.*"—*Hist. Cath. Iber. Compendium,* p. 206, *note,* by Professor Kelly.

had no right either to absolve subjects from their oath of allegiance, or to dispose of their estates. "I am," said he, "undoubtedly persuaded in my conscience, that, by the law of God and his true religion, I am bound to hold with her Majesty. *Her Highness hath never restrained me for matters of religion;* and as I felt her Majesty's indifferency and clemency therein, I have not spared to relieve poor Catholics with dutiful succour. . . . You shall farther understand that I hold my lordships and lands immediately under God of her Majesty, and her most noble progenitors, by corporal service, *and of none other*, by very ancient tenure, which service and tenure *none may dispense withal* but the true possessor of the Crown of England, being now our Sovereign Lady Queen Elizabeth."[1]

Though O'Neill has been long honoured as a champion of the faith by many in Ireland, and though the Sovereign Pontiff loaded him with extraordinary honours, his character is not entitled to much respect. It wants that genuine stamp of nobility, self-denial, consistency, and truthfulness, which we are warranted to look for in the leader of a great religious movement. He spent much of his early life among Protestants; and he long sought to keep up the impression that he had no great objection to conformity.[2] When among professors of the Reformed faith, he attended their worship; and, when past the meridian of life, he repeatedly expressed his readiness to submit himself to the Queen in matters of religion.[3] But he obviously thought little of the obligations of an oath; and again and again he violated the most solemn engagements. He was four times married. He divorced his first wife;[4] he was afterwards a brutal husband; and he was

[1] *Pacata Hibernia*, p. 38. This letter is dated 26th February, 1599 (1600).

[2] See *A Brief Declaration of Ireland*, by Captain Henry Lee, in the *Desiderata Curiosa Hibernica*. This Lee was one of O'Neill's creatures, and some of his statements are not entitled to much confidence. See an account of him in Phelan's *Remains*, ii. 219-223.

[3] *Carew MSS.*, 1589-1600, pp. 38, 172.

[4] Meehan's *Fate and Fortunes of Hugh O'Neill*, p. 447; Haverty, p. 445. When married a second time, the fact of a previous divorce was not generally known; and there still seems to be some mystery about it. The statements of his friends are contradictory. See Meehan, p. 9, *note*.

the father of a number of illegitimate children.[1] But, when it served his purpose, he could act the part of a devotee; and, when he imagined that an earnest profession of Romanism would promote his political designs, he assumed the loftiest style of intolerance and bigotry. The demand for liberty of conscience was soon laid aside: the sword was drawn in the cause of Popish ascendency; and he proclaimed his resolution to fight for the "extirpation of heresy." His Spanish allies avowed the same determination. Had they been permitted to carry out their designs, Irish Protestants would have heard no more of "the free exercise of religion:" they must either have conformed to Popery, or submitted to extermination. When Don Juan de Aquila, the Spanish commander, was at Kinsale, he issued a declaration, in which he announced the fate he intended for all who refused to join the rebellion. "Whosoever," said he, "shall remain in the obedience of the English, *we will persecute him as an heretic, and a hateful enemy of the Church, even unto death.*"[2]

At this period Irish Romanists were split up into two parties—the Papists and the Loyalists.[3] The Papists maintained that the Head of their Church must be obeyed at all hazards, and that the people, at his behest, were bound to rise up in rebellion: the Loyalists believed that

[1] See *Carew MSS.*, 1589-1600, pp. 92, 98, 324. *Calendar of State Papers*, Ireland. James I., 1606-8, p. 19, 125-6. According to O'Donovan his descendants are still "numerous in Tyrone, under the name of MacBaron."—*Annals of the Four Masters*, vi. 2423. In 1613 Sir Dudley Carleton describes him as "*vino plenus et ira* . . . commonly once a night."—MEEHAN'S *Fate and Fortunes of Hugh O'Neill*, p. 387. In the Proclamation issued by James I., on the occasion of the flight of the Earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnel in 1607, the King describes them as persons "who think murder no fault, *marriage of no use*, nor any man worthy to be esteemed valiant that did not glory in rapine and oppression."—See this Proclamation in *Liber Munerum Hiberniae*, vol. i., part iv., 121, 122. See also Hill's *Account of the Macdonnells of Antrim*, p. 212. O'Neill seems to have been a brutal husband. Mr. Hill, without assigning any sufficient reason, discredits the reports of his brutality. It is admitted that his fourth wife was advised "to purchase protection from her husband's *drunken tyranny*." See Hill, p. 211. Belfast, 1873. See also *Proceedings and Papers of the Kilkenny and S.E. of Ireland Archæological Society*, vol. v., part iii., new series, p. 458.

[2] *Pacata Hibernia*, p. 360. Dr. Moran quotes this passage with his usual inaccuracy. He omits the words "even unto death." See his *Archbishops of Dublin*, p. 213.

[3] Cox, p. 454.

the Queen was their rightful sovereign; and that they were not obliged to respect Bulls commanding subjects to engage in civil war, and promising indulgences to insurgents. The weight of ecclesiastical authority was entirely in favour of the Papists. Eugene McEgan, Vicar Apostolic for Munster, thundered out excommunications against all who either fought for the Queen, or who had the humanity to give quarter to the prisoners who were taken fighting on the side of her Government.[1] This ecclesiastic—who is said to have been Bishop of Ross[2]—was now by far the most important Roman Catholic dignitary in Ireland. Had he been quietly permitted to enjoy the preferments heaped on him, he would have been one of the richest churchmen in the British isles; for the Pope gave him livings in Munster valued at three thousand per annum.[3] He had power to dispose at his pleasure of all the ecclesiastical appointments in the Southern Province;[4] and, as he was besides entrusted with the treasure sent from the Continent to assist in carrying on the war, his influence with the laity and clergy, who sided with the Sovereign Pontiff, was almost unbounded. He did not deem it unbecoming his spiritual character to engage personally in the conflicts of the belligerents; and, when he happened to win the field, he did not fail to act up to the letter of his own ferocious excommunications. "As soon," says a trustworthy contemporary, "as any prisoners were taken—though of his own country, birth, and religion—yet, if they had served the Queen, he caused them first—in piety as he pretended—to be confessed and absolved, and instantly, *in his own sight*, would he cause them to be murdered."[5] This bloody man died on the battle-field. In January 1603, when charging the Queen's troops at the head of one hundred and twenty of his fol-

---

[1] Leland, ii. 405; King, p. 835.

[2] King's *Primer*, p. 835; Haverty, p. 490. In a letter to be found in *Pacata Hibernia*, p. 554, he subscribes himself "Owen Hegaine."

[3] Equal to £24,000 a year of our present currency. See *Pacata Hibernia*, p. 663.

[4] See *History and Vindication of the Loyal Formulary or Irish Remonstrance to the Catholics*, p. xxxiv., by Peter Walsh, 1774.

[5] *Pacata Hibernia*, p. 663; Cox, *Hibernia Anglicana*, p. 453; Ware's *Annals*, A.D. 1602; *Carew MSS.*, 1601-3, p. 407.

lowers, with a sword in his right hand and a breviary in his left,[1] he received a mortal wound on the banks of the river Bandon; and thus closed his strange career of cruelty and terror.

The Pope exerted all his influence in support of the insurgents. Not content with publishing a Bull urging the people to rebellion, he addressed a most affectionate letter to the Ulster chieftain, in which he styles him "the noble *Prince* Hugh O'Neill, Commander and Captain-General of the Catholic Army in Ireland."[2] In this epistle the Pontiff professes to exult in the idea that there were still in the Western Isle "many thousands that had not bowed the knee to Baal," and who were disposed to maintain the integrity of the Church, "which is one, Catholic and Apostolic, out of which there is no salvation." He adds—one would almost think in a spirit of rather unseasonable irony, did not the gravity of the occasion quite preclude such a supposition—"God Almighty, the God *of harmony and peace*, shall be with you, and fight for you, and will prostrate, as He has done heretofore, His enemies before our face." To strengthen his cause, O'Neill appealed to the Universities of Valladolid and Salamanca, as to the course to be now followed by the Irish Roman Catholics. In answer to the two questions—"May they assist *the Prince?*" and "May they, without mortal sin, oppose him?" the Doctors replied in a way most satisfactory to the great rebel.[3] But neither the commands of the Pope, nor his assurances of victory, nor the arguments of theologians, could induce the loyal Irish to swerve from their

[1] The author of *Pacata Hibernia* says, "with his sword drawn in one hand and his portius and beads in the other." This is evidently the true account; but Mr. Haverty, perhaps somewhat ashamed of the affair, describes him as "clothed in his pontifical robes" and carrying "his breviary in one hand and *his rosary* in the other."—*History of Ireland*, p. 490, *note*. This monster, McEgan is one of the Roman Catholic *martyrs* of the reign of Elizabeth! The Roman Catholic Walsh says:—"With *his sword drawn in one hand*, and his breviary and beads in the other, he was slain and his troop routed."—*History and Vindication of the Irish Remonstrance*. Introd. xxxiv., 1774.

[2] This letter may be found at length in King's *Primer*. Supplementary volume, 1289-1291. It is dated 20th January, 1601. See also *Pacata Hibernia*, pp. 667-669.

[3] See Phelan's *Remains*, ii. 241; and *Pacata Hibernia*, pp. 511-15.

allegiance. Large numbers of Roman Catholic officers and soldiers were still found in the army of Elizabeth. Lord Barry was not the only peer of his Church who continued to support the royal standard. The Roman Catholic Earl of Thomond, with one thousand men, fought under Lord Mountjoy against O'Neill.[1] Many others of high rank among his co-religionists followed his example.[2]

Neither literature nor religion flourished in Ireland during these times of confusion and civil war. Trinity College, Dublin, had at first a hard struggle for existence; and had it not again and again received assistance from the State,[3] its Provost and Fellows, through sheer poverty, might have been obliged to discontinue their labours. For a long period there were few students in attendance. Meanwhile, throughout the country, Protestantism was making scarcely any visible progress. Until a late period of the reign of Elizabeth, Roman Catholics continued to enjoy the temporalities of the bishoprics, as well as of the rectories of the Church, in various parts of Ireland. Towards the close of the century, and when delivered from the immediate dread of a Spanish Armada, the Queen began to insist more strictly on conformity. In November 1594, she issued a commission to the two Primates and others "to tender to *all archbishops, bishops*, deans, archdeacons, parsons, vicars, officers, or ministers whatsoever ecclesiastical," the oath of supremacy; and directed them to proceed against such persons as should "peremptorily or obstinately refuse" to take it, "according to the

---

[1] Kelly's *Dissertations*, p. 321.

[2] *Ibid.* Archbishop Ussher, in a speech delivered in Dublin Castle, in the beginning of the reign of Charles I., states that "for all the Pope's promises and threatenings, which were also seconded by a declaration of the Divines of Salamanca and Valladolid, not only the lords and gentlemen did constantly continue their allegiance unto the Queen, *but also were encouraged so to do by the priests of the Pale, that were of the Popish profession.*"—Elrington's *Life*, p. 81.

[3] In November 1599 the Lords Justices, hearing that the Fellows and Corporation of the College are "fallen into great want, and thereby not able to hold their society together without some present help and relief," agree that they shall "receive *weekly* the sum of forty shillings."—*Calendar of Patent and Close Rolls of Chancery in Ireland*, by Morrin, ii. 554. In April following a grant of £200 per annum was made. *Ibid.* pp. 554, 555.

tenor, force, and effect of the statute," at their discretion.[1] In the warrant appointing the commissioners she intimates that many refused to "confess and set forth her superiority, prerogative, and pre-eminence within the realm," and also "to observe such ceremonies and orders in divine service as had been established and set forth by the laws and statutes." This document supplies evidence that, not many years before the death of Elizabeth, there were still some, in the very highest places of the Church, who had not taken the oath of supremacy, and who did not conform to the prescribed ritual in the celebration of worship.

At this period the Protestant Established Church of Ireland presented a most humiliating spectacle. Many of the clergy had changed the Mass-Book for the Prayer-Book; and yet, in spirit and character, they remained the same as before. The adoption of a new creed had led to no personal reformation. The country was still cursed with a most worthless ministry. The remains of the old priesthood—men ready to conform to whatever the State might dictate, without knowledge, without piety, and too often even without decency—filled a large number of the ecclesiastical offices. "Whatever disorders," says an eye-witness, "you see in the Church of England, you may find there [in Ireland], and many more; namely, gross simony, greedy covetousness, fleshly incontinency, careless sloth, and generally all disordered life in the common clergyman. And, besides all these, they have their particular enormities; for all Irish priests, which now enjoy the Church livings, are in a manner mere laymen, saving that they have taken holy orders; but otherwise they do go and live like laymen, follow all kind of husbandry and other worldly affairs, as other

[1] *Calendar of Patent and Close Rolls of Chancery in Ireland*, by Morrin, vol. ii. p. 292. In 1600 the lords of the English Council instructed the Irish Lords Justices "to deal moderately in the great matter of religion;" and thus, says Mant, "although not repealed, the Act of Uniformity ceased to be enforced."—*Hist. of the Church of Ireland*, i. 338. Kelly candidly admits that Mountjoy allowed the Roman Catholic citizens of Dublin "the same toleration they had enjoyed, *almost uninterruptedly*, from the commencement of Elizabeth's reign."—*Dissertations on Irish Church History*, p. 327.

Irishmen do. They neither read Scriptures, nor preach to the people, nor administer the Communion; but baptism they do, for they christen yet after the Popish fashion."[1] Adventurers from across the Channel—including some of the very off-scourings of the Church of England—contrived to get possession of not a few of the most lucrative appointments. All accounts concur in representing the Bishops and inferior clergy as, with few exceptions, lukewarm and inefficient. "The Irish bishops," says Spenser, "have their clergy in such awe and subjection under them, that they dare not complain of them, so as they may do to them what they please; for they, knowing their own unworthiness and incapacity, and that they are therefore still removable at their Bishop's will, yield what pleaseth him, and he taketh what he listeth; yea, and some of them, whose dioceses are in remote parts, somewhat out of the world's eye, do not at all bestow the benefices which are in their own donation upon any, but keep them in their own hands, and set their own servants and horse-boys to take up the tithes and fruits of them—with the which some of them purchase great lands and build fair castles upon the same. Of which abuse, if any question be moved, they have a very seemly colour and excuse that they have no worthy ministers to bestow them upon, but keep them [to be] so bestowed for any such sufficient person as any shall bring unto them."[2]

As a body, the Romish clergy far exceeded the Protestant ministers in courage, energy, and self-denial. By the influence of superstition they ruled, with almost unbounded sway, over the ignorant multitude. Sir Henry Power, the Royal Commissioner for Munster, states that, in 1600, the cities and walled towns of that province were "so besotted and bewitched with the Popish priests, Jesuits, and Seminarists, that, *for fear of their cursings and excommunications,* they were ready upon every small occasion to rise in arms."[3] In all

[1] *View of the State of Ireland*, by Spenser, pp. 139, 140. Spenser wrote this work after the opening of Trinity College, Dublin, in 1594. He died before the close of the century.

[2] Spenser's *View of the State of Ireland*, pp. 140, 141. Dublin, 1809.

[3] *Pacata Hiberna*, p. 57.

the rebellions of this reign Romish ecclesiastics figure conspicuously. Many of the bishops spent far more time in intriguing at foreign courts than in attending to their duties at home. During the rebellion of O'Neill, Matthew De Oviedo, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, came over from Spain with an invading army.[1] He thus only followed the example of others who had preceded him not long before.[2] These men were willing to compass sea and land either to make converts or to organize revolution. Their whole course of life attested that they quite misapprehended the duties of Christ's ministers; and yet they had "a form of godliness" which imposed on a credulous and unenlightened generation. Though many of them could indulge without any compunction in drunkenness, lying, revenge, perfidy, and profane swearing, they laboured with wonderful industry to make the people acquainted with the peculiar rites and forms of Popery; they laid much stress on crossings, genuflexions, and the invocation of saints; they observed fasts; they went on pilgrimages; and they heard confessions with unwearied diligence. If the people could not see in them the beauty of holiness, they could scarcely fail to discern the zeal of fanaticism.[3] Their efforts for the maintenance of their Church rebuked the apathy of the Protestant clergy. The author of the *Fairy Queen* now lived in the south of the kingdom; and as he contemplated the conduct of most of the ministers around him who professed his creed, he could not but deplore how sadly Protestantism was betrayed, misrepresented, and dishonoured. He had no confidence in the doctrine that, in a country like Ireland, the sword was to make way for the Gospel. The harsh treatment of the poor natives—who, in

[1] In September 1601. See before, p. 387. This was at least the second occasion on which Oviêdo entered the country in a hostile manner. He came over with Fitzmaurice in 1579. See Moran's *Archbishops of Dublin*, pp. 195, 197.

[2] See before, p. 422.

[3] The people are represented by Spenser as in the lowest depths of ignorance. "They be all Papists by their profession, but in the same so blindly and brutishly informed, for the most part, that not one amongst a hundred knoweth any ground of religion, or any article of his faith, but can perhaps say his Pater Noster, or his Ave Maria, without any knowledge or understanding what one word thereof meaneth."—*View of the State of Ireland*, p. 137.

obedience to the exhortations of their priests and the commands of their feudal lords, adhered to their religion, and fought, as they were taught to believe, for its preservation—inspired him at once with pity and disgust. Whilst the people were left destitute of an able and devoted ministry, he saw clearly the absurdity of attempting to extinguish Romanism by excluding its professors from civil offices, by exacting fines for non-attendance on Protestant worship, and by other such political appliances. "In planting of religion thus much is needful to be observed," says he, "that it be not sought forcibly to be impressed into them with terror and sharp penalties—as now is the manner—but rather delivered and intimated with mildness and gentleness, so as it may not be hated before it be understood, and their professors despised and rejected. And therefore it is expedient that some discreet ministers of their own countrymen be sent over amongst them, which by their meek persuasions and instructions, as else by their sober lives and conversations, may draw them, first to understand, and afterwards to embrace, the doctrine of their salvation. For if the ancient godly fathers, which first converted them, when they were infidels, to the faith, were able to pull them from idolatry and paganism to the true belief in Christ—as Saint Patrick and Saint Columb—how much more easily shall godly teachers bring them to the true understanding of that which they already professed? Wherein it is great wonder to see the odds which is between the zeal of Popish priests and the ministers of the gospel; for they spare not to come out of Spain, from Rome, and from Rheims, by long toil and dangerous travelling hither, where they know peril of death awaiteth them, and no reward of riches is to be found, only to draw the people unto the Church of Rome; whereas, some of our idle ministers, having a way for credit and estimation thereby opened unto them, and having the livings of the country offered unto them, without pains and without peril, will neither for the same, nor any love of God, nor zeal of religion, nor for all the good they may do, by winning souls to God, be drawn forth from their warm nests to look out into God's harvest, which is even ready for the sickle, and all the fields yellow long ago: doubt-

less those good old godly fathers will, I fear me, rise up in the day of judgment to condemn them."[1]

When we find such facts vouched by a pious and intelligent adherent of the Reformed faith who had the best means of information, we can well understand why Irish Protestantism so languished in the days of Queen Elizabeth.

---

[1] *View of the State of Ireland*, pp. 253-5.

CHAPTER VI.

THE REIGN OF JAMES I. A.D. 1603 TO A.D. 1625.

THE accession of King James of Scotland to the English throne was hailed with cordial satisfaction by the native Irish; and, at the commencement of his reign, he stood high in their estimation. According to their views, it was no slight recommendation to him that some of his remote ancestors had flourished in their own green isle, and that he traced his descent from a long line of Hibernian monarchs.[1] The Roman Catholics had been led to believe that the son of Mary Stuart—so long the hope of their Church—was not unfriendly to their religion.[2] Acting under this impression, or determined at all hazards to make an effort in favour of their creed, they no sooner heard of Elizabeth's demise than they proceeded to restore their worship in all its splendour in a number of the leading towns of Leinster and Munster.[3] The priests, arrayed in official costume, appeared accordingly in public, walking ostentatiously in processions: the monas-

---

[1] See *Cambrensis Eversus*, iii. 53-67.

[2] Before his elevation to the English throne he had been coquetting with the Pope, and endeavouring to persuade the Romish party that he was not indisposed to look with favour on the religion of his mother. See *An Historical and Critical Account of his Life and Writings*, by William Harris. London, 1772, pp. 19, 29, 104.

[3] Though the open country had been sadly desolated by the wars of Desmond and O'Neill, many of the towns of Munster had meanwhile been enriched. Large sums of money had been sent there from England to pay the soldiers, and the inhabitants sold provisions to the belligerents at exorbitant prices. See *Pacata Hibernia*, Part i., p. 196.

teries, which had been converted to civil uses, were seized and re-occupied; and mass was celebrated in churches from which the legal ministers were expelled.[1] But the Lord-Deputy Mountjoy promptly interfered, and repressed these symptoms of insubordination. Marching southwards, he found the gates of Waterford closed against him; and the inhabitants—who pleaded the provisions of a charter of King John—at first refused to admit his soldiers. His menaces—to which his well-known decision of character imparted a most emphatic significance—soon induced them to give way. A strong garrison was stationed in their city; they renounced all foreign jurisdiction; and once more recognized the ascendency of Protestantism. Cork, Cashel, Clonmel, Limerick, and other towns in which Romanism had been re-established, were intimidated, and restored to submission. Immediately afterwards, an Act of oblivion and indemnity was published, announcing a free pardon to all who had committed offences against the Crown until the time of his Majesty's accession; liberating the whole of the Irish "churls," or peasantry, from the capricious tyranny of the chieftains; and admitting them, on the same terms as the other subjects of the kingdom, to the protection and benefits of the constitution.[2]

This Act of oblivion and indemnity was well fitted to promote social order; but the question of religion continued to create perplexity and confusion. The Irish Protestant Establishment still presented a melancholy spectacle. Al-

---

[1] Leland, ii. 413. Fynes Moryson's *History of Ireland*, ii. 317, 322. An account of the proceedings at Waterford and elsewhere, by James White, Vicar Apostolic of Waterford and Lismore, who himself acted a prominent part on the occasion, may be found in Duffy's *Irish Catholic Magazine*, vol. ii. 271-275, 296-302. Dublin, 1848. White states that, after the Romanists had been obliged to give up the churches, "the priests celebrated low and solemn masses *with full liberty* in private houses, preached to the people, and discharged all the other functions of their holy ministry," down to the date of his departure from Ireland on the 18th of November, 1603. It appears that White at this time, when referring publicly to the demise of Elizabeth, informed the citizens that "*Jezebel was dead.*" King, p. 851. Respecting White, see also Leland, ii. 415, *note* MacNevin's *Confis. of Ulster*, p. 14, *note.*

[2] Cox, Part ii. 8; Leland, ii. 416.

most all the churches had long been in a state of decay: many of them were now unroofed and unfit for worship;[1] and their desolation only too truly indicated the spiritual condition of the community around them. According to the testimony of an intelligent contemporary, who held a high official position in the country,[2] the bishops were as "priests of Jeroboam, taken out of the basest of the people, more fit to sacrifice to a calf than to intermeddle with the religion of God." One of them, lately deceased, had been "a poor singing man void of knowledge of his grammar rules;" and his successor was "of like insufficiency." Another, who held three bishoprics, was "utterly unlearned." There was "not one able preacher in all the province (of Munster), nor three sufficient bishops in all the kingdom."[3] As a body, the parochial clergy were no better than the lords spiritual. "The Churchmen for the most part throughout the kingdom," says Sir John Davys, "were such as could not read; and yet the most of them, whereof many were serving-men, and some horse-boys, were not without two or three benefices apiece; nevertheless, for all their pluralities, they were most of them beggars; for the patron, or ordinary, or some of their friends, took the greater part of their profits by a plain contract before their institution; so that many gentlemen and some women, and some priests and Jesuits, have the greatest

---

[1] Sir John Davys, who held the office of Attorney-General for Ireland in this reign, says:—"The churches are ruined and fallen, and down to the ground, in all parts of the kingdom. There is no divine service, no christening of children, no receiving of the sacrament, no Christian meeting or assembly, no not once in a year." —*Calendar of State Papers*, James I., 1606-8. Preface, p. 55.

[2] Justice Saxey.

[3] *Calendar of State Papers* of the reign of James I., 1606-8. Preface, p. 55. London, 1874. The reader must recollect that Miler Magrath, Archbishop of Cashel, still survived. In 1610 he obtained William Knight as his coadjutor. Cotton's *Fasti*, i. 12. The coadjutor seems to have been also a person of worthless character. A contemporary says: "McGrath is still alive, extremely old and bed-rid; cursed by the Protestants for wasting the revenues and manors of the ancient See of Cashel, and derided by the Catholics, who are well acquainted with the drunken habits of himself and his coadjutor Knight."—Meehan's *Rise and Fall of the Irish Franciscan Monasteries*, p. 81. Dublin, 1869.

benefit of our benefices, though these poor unlettered clerks bear the name of incumbents."[1]

Under such circumstances, it was not wonderful that the Romish clergy maintained a firm hold on the sympathy and confidence of the people. Though the priests were sunk in superstition, they kept up at least "a form of godliness;" and some of them, by their fastings and other austerities, had acquired a high reputation for sanctity. In the present wretched position of the Protestant Church they were peculiarly formidable. They could speak the native tongue—used almost exclusively everywhere beyond the pale; many of them had been educated in seminaries on the Continent, where their hatred to England was fostered, and their bigotry intensified; a few of them, scattered all over the island, were well supplied with the most popular arguments against Protestantism; they were trained in the chicanery of the Jesuits; and their hopes of ecclesiastical promotion depended on the success of rebellion. Their general knowledge was very limited; they were grossly ignorant of Scripture; their manners were coarse; and their moral conduct was far from irreproachable: but the multitude to whom they ministered had been long accustomed to estimate character according to a very low standard; so that little scandal was created by their habitual profanity or their incorrigible drunkenness. They had been taught to regard sedition as patriotism, and to honour as martyrs of the Church such of their brethren as had been punished for disloyalty. Their readiness to encounter danger for the sake of their religion attested their sincerity, and awakened the admiration of their countrymen. Had they quietly availed themselves of the imperfect toleration they enjoyed, it might have been enlarged and at length legalized; but the more ambitious spirits among them were determined to be satisfied with nothing less than their ancient

[1] *Calendar of State Papers*, James I., 1606-8. Preface, pp. 54, 55. Sir John Davys, in his letter "touching the state of Monaghan, Fermanagh, and Cavan," written in 1607, says: "*At this day* the Pope doth collate unto them (all dignities in cathedral churches and all benefices of value), and *until this day* the parsons presented *have enjoyed the benefices* in this mere Irish country by colour of the Pope's collation."

ascendency. Thus it was that the country was kept in constant alarm by their political plottings. Their incessant activity, and their treasonable correspondence with France, Italy, and Spain, did not escape the notice of the administration; and it was eventually deemed necessary to take very decided steps to check their proceedings.

At this time there was no enactment in the Irish statute-book which could give much annoyance to the mass of the Roman Catholic population. The Oath of Supremacy could be legally tendered only to a limited number of persons; and government officials often had instructions not to press it on Roman Catholic noblemen and gentlemen of admitted loyalty. A shilling a Sunday for absence from the Established worship was the only penalty to which ordinary Romanists were liable; and, during the whole of the reign of Elizabeth, this fine was rarely exacted.[1] But, early in the reign of James I., a new and less tolerant policy was inaugurated. The priests—especially those trained abroad—appear to have provoked this severity. They were the ringleaders in the recent revolt of the cities of Munster. They sometimes created much confusion by breaking up matrimonial engagements,[2] and by uniting in wedlock to other parties persons thus illegally divorced. They inveighed in their sermons against the Government; stirred up opposition to its arrangements; excommunicated jurors who returned verdicts favourable to the Crown; and induced wives to refuse to cohabit with husbands inclined to conformity.[3] They assailed with peculiar malignity any ministers of the Establishment who were honestly labouring to advance the interests of Protestantism. In

---

[1] "By the Court Rolls," says a correspondent of Sir James Mackintosh in 1810, "I find she (Elizabeth) had her high Ecclesiastical Commissioners who occasionally punished for not attending divine service. But this was rare; *no more than two or three instances during her reign.*"—*Calendar of State Papers*, James I., 1606-8. Preface, p. 104, *note.*

[2] It was in consequence proposed to make a law that any priest "separating and divorcing man and wife" should be judged a felon.—*Calendar of Carew MSS.*, 1603-1624, p. 158. London, 1873. A law legalizing marriages condemned by the Church of Rome had been made in 1542. It is the 33rd of Henry VIII., chap. vi.

[3] *Calendar of State Papers*, James I., 1606-8, pp. 586, 507, 526. Preface, p. 88.

August, 1604, Sir Henry Brouncker, Lord President of Munster, issued a proclamation commanding the Romish clergy to withdraw, by the 30th of September following, from all the corporate towns in that province;[1] and on the 4th of July, 1605, a royal ordinance appeared, requiring "all Jesuits, seminary priests, or other priests whatsoever," before the 10th day of the ensuing December, "to depart out of the kingdom of Ireland."[2] In this document the King admonishes all his subjects duly to resort to their parish churches to hear divine service every Sunday and holiday, as he will have the pains and penalties of the statute-book henceforth put in execution against recusants. On the 16th of October of the same year another draft of this proclamation was promulgated. In this new edition the people were enjoined to attend the Established service, not only to avoid the legal penalties, but also "on pain of his Majesty's high displeasure, and of such farther punishments as may be lawfully inflicted upon the wilful contemners of his royal commands, proclamations, and prerogatives."[3]

These proclamations were certainly not warranted by the provisions of the Irish statute-book. As yet no law was to be found there ordaining the banishment of priests, or imposing on absentees from the Established worship any higher penalty than the trivial sum mentioned in the Act of Uniformity.[4] The Irish law officers of the Crown were not ignorant of the difficulty; and they endeavoured, as best they

---

[1] *Calendar of State Papers*, James I., 1606-8. Preface, 84.

[2] *Ibid.* Preface, 60, 61. The proclamation may be found in Burke's *Hibernia Dominicana*, pp. 611, 612. Dr. Moran, who has a strange faculty for mis-stating facts, alleges that this edict was issued on the *28th of September*, and that it commanded the Popish clergy "to depart within *ten days* from the kingdom under *penalty of death*." Anyone who harboured them was "to be *hanged at his own door*." See Moran's *Memoir* prefixed to Lombard's *Commentarius*, p. xliv. Dublin, 1868. All this is pure invention. The proclamation merely states that the clergy, if apprehended, were to be kept in prison until the Lord-Lieutenant or Council should give instructions concerning them.

[3] *Calendar of State Papers*, James I., 1606-8. Preface, p. 80.

[4] This sum was sufficiently formidable to the lower classes, as money was then much more valuable than at present; and, when payment was refused, the shilling was sometimes increased to ten by law expenses.

could, to defend these proceedings. In the reign of Elizabeth a bill for the banishment of priests from "the Queen's dominions" had received the sanction of the English Legislature;[1] and they argued that this Act authorized the recent proclamations. But Irish lawyers were not satisfied with the explanation.[2] They contended that Acts passed in Great Britain were not valid in this country until accepted by the native Parliament; and, in support of their views, they adduced arguments which could not be well confuted. On legal grounds, the threat of punishing absentees from Protestant worship with penalties not named in the statute-book was quite indefensible. This part of the proclamation was unquestionably an undue stretch of the prerogative. It was found that the wealthier Romanists despised the penalty of a shilling a Sunday; and the King sought to concuss them into conformity by dealing with them as contemners of his royal authority. In certain cases each individual received what was called a "Mandate," or letter under the Broad Seal, addressed to him by name, commanding his attendance at church in presence of the Lord-Deputy or Council. Should he fail to appear, he was handed over to the court of Star Chamber, where he incurred a heavy fine and imprisonment during pleasure.[3]

These proclamations appear to have been mainly designed to guide the movements of the inhabitants of the corporate towns; as, in many other places, there were no Protestant ministers who could preach, or even read the Church service effectively. It was probably expected that, in the matter of conformity, the rural population would follow the example of the citizens and aldermen. The sequel was somewhat different. In various districts the announcement of the royal will produced a considerable impression. Sir

[1] The 27th of Eliz.

[2] The law officers in England evidently did not consider that the Act extended to this country, as they sometimes transported their banished priests into Ireland! See *Calendar of State Papers*, James I., 1606-8. Preface, p. 64. The Irish lawyers also pleaded on this occasion that had the 27th of Elizabeth been intended to apply to Ireland, this would have been stated in the Act itself.

[3] *Calendar of State Papers*, James I., 1606-8. Preface, p. 79.

Henry Brouncker reported that the Lord Bishop of Cork "brought all his tenants with him to church;" and that they listened with marked attention to an Irish preacher provided for their instruction.[1] Some other landlords in the same part of the island were, for a time, equally successful in reducing their tenants to conformity.[2] The Lord-Deputy Chichester stated that "most of the priests in his government of Carrickfergus had taken the Oath of Supremacy;" and news arrived from Connaught to the effect that forty priests in that province had pursued the same course.[3] In some districts of Leinster the results were most encouraging. All the inhabitants of the town of Trim became conformists;[4] and in King's County and Queen's County there were many parishes where all the natives attended the Established worship.[5] But the Protestant incumbents could claim little credit for this change. "The reformation wrought in this kind through the kingdom," says one who was well acquainted with the state of the country,[6] "is principally effected *through the civil magistrate;* for the churches which are yet in ruin everywhere, and whereof the greatest number want curates to perform Christian duties in them, accuse the clergy of extreme negligence."[7]

If the Lord-Deputy expected obedience to his proclamations from the inhabitants of the corporate towns, he soon found how far he was mistaken. In these centres of influence he met with determined opposition. Most of the wealthier and more respectable citizens were bound by strong ties to the Church of Rome. They had long been in correspondence with its dignitaries, or they had very near relatives among its bishops[8] or priesthood. They had often heard its claims

---

[1] *Ibid.* Preface, p. 88.

[2] *Ibid.* [3] *Ibid.* Preface, p. 62. [4] *Ibid.* Preface, p. 85.

[5] *Ibid.* [6] Sir John Davys.

[7] *Calendar of State Papers,* James I., 1606-8. Preface, p. 85.

[8] Mr. King states that Cornelius Ryan, or O'Melrian, R.C. Bishop of Killaloe, whose living was abroad, "appears to have been the only Romish bishop, having the title of an Irish See, in the first years of the reign of King James I." Supplem. vol. 890. This is certainly a mistake. Peter Lombard was appointed Archbishop of Armagh before the death of Elizabeth. Richard Brady, who became R.C

expounded by its ablest advocates, so that they were built up in attachment to it; and they had been taught to identify it with the cause of piety and patriotism. They had seen very little which commended Protestantism; for its principles had seldom or never been faithfully explained to them; and it had been too often represented by time-serving and worthless ministers. It was not, therefore, extraordinary that they did not relish the idea of conformity. Many of them inwardly detested the rule of Great Britain; and when required by an English viceroy to give up their religion at his bidding, they felt insulted and indignant. In Waterford, New Ross, Clonmel, Kinsale, Cashel, Limerick, and Cork, the principal aldermen and burgesses submitted to fines and imprisonment rather than attend the Protestant worship. At Galway, fines to the amount of one hundred and seventy pounds were struck against five of the citizens.[1] The Mayor of Cork was fined in one hundred pounds;[2] the Sovereign of Kinsale was mulcted in the same sum; and in several cases burgesses or gentlemen were required each to pay fifty or sixty pounds.[3] In the Irish metropolis Government had to deal with some of the most resolute of the recusants. Nine of the Dublin aldermen were fined in one hundred pounds each; and seven other citizens in fifty pounds each.[4] These sixteen nonconformists were farther to remain prisoners in the Castle during the pleasure of the Deputy and Council.[5]

Such harsh proceedings, as might have been anticipated,

Bishop of Kilmore in 1580, survived till 1607. Cornelius O'Devany, who became R.C. Bishop of Down and Connor in 1582, survived till 1612. Nial O'Boyle, who became R.C. Bishop of Raphoe in 1591, lived till 1611. Matthew d'Oviedo, who became R.C. Archbishop of Dublin in 1600, died in 1609. Dermod McGrahe, who became R.C. Bishop of Cork in 1580, died in 1606. Brady's *Irish Reformation*, pp. 70, 77, 87, 92, 123, 136, 143, 156, 162. Sir John Davys, writing in November 1606, gives the names of no less than fourteen Irish R.C. bishops, and states that there were others of whom he had "no certain intelligence."—*Calendar of State Papers*, James I., 1606-8, pp. 17, 18. This document may be found at the end of this volume as Appendix II.

[1] *Calendar of State Papers*, James I., 1609-8. Preface, p. 99.

[2] This mayor soon afterwards conformed. We may presume that his fine was cancelled. See *Calendar, &c.*, p. 25.

[3] *Ibid.* Preface, p. 93.

[4] *Ibid.* Preface, p. 80.

[5] *Ibid.* Preface, pp. 80, 81.

awakened immense dissatisfaction. The imprisoned aldermen and burgesses refused to pay the fines; and when attempts were made to enter their houses and seize their goods, there was a general murmur of discontent sufficient to intimidate even a bold administration. The leading Roman Catholics, instead of quailing before the threatened danger, assumed a more defiant attitude; denounced the proclamations as illegal;[1] and appealed to the English Privy Council. The proposal to banish all the Popish clergy would, if carried out, have led to the infliction of an indiscriminate severity which no one could vindicate. The priests remained in the country despite the royal ordinance. They incurred no danger in districts where all the inhabitants belonged to their communion; but some of them were occasionally exposed to as much peril as was just fitted to throw an air of romance around their mission. The English Privy Council soon saw the folly of persisting in the course on which they had adventured: they relinquished the intention of effecting the wholesale expulsion of the Romish clergy; and sent over instructions to the Irish officials to recede, as discreetly as possible, from the awkward position in which they found themselves. When referring to a petition presented to them on behalf of many citizens and aldermen of Cork who had been long confined for recusancy, they suggested that the Lord President of Munster should adopt a more indulgent policy. "They cannot hope that the people of Ireland will be much reformed in religion by extraordinary rigour and severity, and must needs doubt lest such a course, not usual in times past, nor warranted by the laws of that kingdom, may stir evil humours to a desperate and dangerous resolution. . . . They do not, however, wish the course the Lord President has begun to be so suddenly dissolved that any public notice might be taken of it as an error committed by him; and they leave it to his own discretion how to order the matter towards those that have so long continued in prison."[2] In

[1] On this occasion Sir Patrick Barnwell pleaded the cause of his co-religionists with great ability and courage.

[2] *Calendar of State Papers*, James I., 1606-8. Lords of the Council to the President of Munster, dated April 1607, pp. 138, 139.

the end, the fines, if not cancelled, were reduced to a mere fraction of the sums originally named;[1] the imprisoned aldermen and citizens were set at liberty; and the attempt to produce conformity by the issue of royal "Mandates" was abandoned.

The readiness with which so many persons, in public stations, submitted to fines and imprisonment rather than conform to the Established Church, proves that a large portion of the most intelligent of the Irish people were still very earnest Romanists. But though, owing to the unhappy circumstances under which Protestantism was introduced, the religion of the Pope retained undiminished power over the great body of the natives, it must be admitted that the reign of James I. is the commencement of a new era in the ecclesiastical as well as in the civil history of Ireland. The country was now at length thoroughly subdued; the oppressive privileges of the chieftains were abolished; the Brehon law was set aside; tanistry, gavelkind, and other old Irish usages disappeared along with it; the division of the island into counties was fully carried out; judges, nominated by the English Government, went on circuit into districts which they had never visited before; and all ranks of the inhabitants were obliged to obey the enactments of the colonial legislature. At this crisis an event occurred in Ulster which led to a vast change in the social position of that province. The flight of the two great northern dynasts—the Earls of Tyrconnel and Tyrone—completed the downfall of Irish feudalism. The fugitives were dangerous conspirators,[2] but, immediately before their

[1] Thus Sir Arthur Chichester states that the fines imposed in the province of Munster "amounted to £7,000, *but not above four score pounds thereof were levied.*" —*Calendar of State Papers*, James I., 1606-8, pp. 246, 247.

[2] The representations of such writers as Meehan, who endeavours to persuade his readers (*Fate and Fortunes of Tyrone and Tyrconnel*) that O'Neill was an innocent man, and that he was obliged to leave his country to escape persecution, are surely too ridiculous to impose even on the most credulous. According to Meehan's own account, O'Neill continued to plot against the English Government till the end of his days. Mr. Moore, in his *History of Ireland*, has expressed himself more candidly. Speaking of the letters of Sir John Davys, relating to the Earl of Tyrone, he says: "That at this time the chief (O'Neill) had again

disappearance, the Ministers of the Crown had not obtained such proofs of their guilt as were deemed sufficient to secure their conviction; and their sudden withdrawal from the country, of their own accord, is one of those strange incidents in which we can scarcely fail to see the finger of Providence. Believing that their treasonable designs had been discovered, and knowing that they were unable to struggle with the power of England, these noblemen, in the beginning of September 1607 provided for their own safety by abruptly taking their departure for the Continent. They never again saw their native shores. In July 1608, Sir Cahir O'Dogherty, of Innishowen, another of the chiefs of Ulster, perished in a bootless rebellion; and thus estates in the six counties of Derry, Donegal, Tyrone, Fermanagh, Cavan, and Armagh—to the extent of half a million of acres—were forfeited to the Crown.

These forfeitures prepared the way for a scheme which found peculiar favour with the British Sovereign. Various attempts had recently been made to improve Ireland by the introduction of colonists from the sister island; and though such enterprises had hitherto met with little success, James resolved

---

embarked in treasonable schemes, though still living on friendly terms with the Lord Deputy, *these letters leave no room to doubt.*"—*Hist. of Ireland*, iv. 156. See also the conclusive statements in O'Conor's *Historical Address*, Part ii., 225-30. Buckingham, 1812. O'Neill died at Rome in July 1616, in the 76th year of his age. Tyrconnel died in the same city, in July 1608. After leaving Ireland the fugitives landed in France, and passed on from thence into the Low Countries. They arrived in Rome about Easter 1608. They and their company were received there with extraordinary honours. Five Cardinals met them several miles from the city; and they entered it in five carriages each drawn by six horses. They were subsequently treated as personages of great worth and distinction. The Pope furnished Tyrone with a palace for his residence, and gave him a pension during life. When he and his party were in the Low Countries they attracted attention by "their barbarous life and drunkenness," and when in Italy their morals do not appear to have improved. See *Calendar of State Papers*: Ireland, 1606-8, pp. 435, 668. Tyrconnel and Tyrone published statements apologizing for their flight, in which they intimate that they could not remain in Ireland because they could not enjoy there the exercise of their religion. This was a miserable falsehood—as they had never been disturbed on that account. The simple truth was that Government was on the track of their conspiracy to seize Dublin Castle and murder the Viceroy; and, suspecting this, they fled to the Continent in hope of enlisting the support of R.C. sovereigns. But in this they were disappointed.

once more to renew the experiment on the confiscated estates of the northern chieftains. This project, known as the Ulster Plantation, was wisely managed and hopefully prosecuted. The lands to be planted were divided into sections of one thousand, fifteen hundred, and two thousand acres, each: Protestants from England and Scotland were encouraged to occupy them: these settlers were required to build castles or substantial houses in positions of strength: and the natives were permitted to dwell among them in the open country—where they could be constantly under the supervision of the British undertakers. The corporation of the city of London obtained possession of a large part of what had been called the county of Coleraine, but which was now named, after its new proprietors, the county of *Londonderry*. They were bound by their agreement to build and fortify the towns of Coleraine and Londonderry, and otherwise to expend twenty thousand pounds on their estates. According to the terms prescribed for those who obtained possession of the escheated property, the strangers were to take the Oath of Supremacy, and "to conform themselves in religion according to his Majesty's laws;"[1] but the natives, though admitted to be freeholders, were not obliged to enter into these engagements.[2] The condition as to taking the Oath of Supremacy does not appear to have been very rigorously enforced. Several years after the commencement of the Plantation, it had not been observed by a considerable number even of the English colonists.[3]

The Plantation was arranged and carried out under the

---

[1] Orders and Conditions for the Planters of Ulster. Harris's *Hibernica*, p. 126. Dublin, 1770.

[2] Even the Irish who had engaged in the rebellion of Tyrone were admitted as freeholders. "To gain them, if possible, by favour and lenity, they were," says Leland, "treated with particular indulgence. Their undertenants and servants were allowed to be of their own country *and religion*, and while all the other planters were obliged to take the Oath of Supremacy, *they were tacitly exempted*."—*Hist. of Ireland*, ii. 431. See also "Articles for the Irish Natives who shall be admitted to be Freeholders," in Harris's *Hibernica*, p. 129.

[3] This is plain from various statements in Pynnar's *Survey*, which was made in 1618-19. In some cases not one-half of the settlers had then taken the oath. See Harris's *Hibernica*, pp. 153, 155, 159, 161, 165, 178, 180, 183.

direction of Sir Arthur Chichester,[1]—a statesman of great experience and ability, who was at this time Lord Deputy of Ireland. As a political measure it has often been criticized with severity. In a spirit of absurd exaggeration it has been described as the *Confiscation of Ulster;*[2] and denounced as a gigantic injustice. It has been said that on this occasion the innocent were punished with the guilty; and that a whole community suffered for the offences of a few rebel leaders. That there may have been cases of individual hardship may be readily admitted; and it was not strange that the natives were dissatisfied when they saw colonists put into possession of broad lands which had been occupied by themselves and

[1] The founder of the Donegall family. MacNevin, in his *Confiscation of Ulster*, represents Chichester as a lawless spoiler, and insinuates that, were all his letters and despatches forthcoming, they would fully reveal his guilt. The following extract from his letter to the Council in England, dated 14th October, 1608, recently published, leads to a very different inference:—"Some *good consideration* must be had of *the natives*, who are many, that either the principal gentlemen, so accounted, among them, or else the *honester sort* and *best deserving*, may be withal *so satisfied* in this division as may *quench envy*."—*Calendar of Patent and Close Rolls of Chancery in Ireland*, of Charles I., by Morrin, p. 633. Dublin, 1863.

[2] See *The Confiscation of Ulster*, by T. MacNevin. Dublin, 1846. Such works are only fitted to mislead the public. The learned Dr. O'Conor, himself a Roman Catholic, states that "the forfeited lands amounted by Watson's, Chichester's, and Pynnar's *Surveys* to *two millions* of acres, and that not more than 250,682 were disposed of to the new Planters, of whom *many thousands* were Catholics." He adds: "Lord Castlehaven was one of them, and he planted 9,000 acres with 3,000 Catholic Irish, under twenty gentlemen. King James granted the whole barony of *Maghera Stefana* (6,480 acres) in 1611 to Connor-Roe Maguire, the grandfather of that very Lord Maguire who was one of the leading conspirators in 1641, allowing him also a pension of £200 a year for life. . . . Sir Phelim O'Nial of Kinnard's grandfather had a grant, June 20, 1615, of the entire territory called Gage's Country, and all that territory was confirmed to himself by a new Patent, dated May 6, 1629."—*Historical Address*, Part ii. 296-8. The statement of O'Conor is somewhat corrected by Dr. Reid. He says: "The extent of the forfeited lands is stated by Carte at 'above half a million of acres,' but Pynnar, who is much more accurate, gives it at about 400,000 acres. . . . The remaining million and a half of acres comprised not only the unprofitable lands, but also *large tracts of country held by the native proprietors who, either being not implicated in the revolt of* 1607, *or having made timely submission, were unmolested in their estates.* . . . . I find that of the 400,000 forfeited acres, 100,000 were granted for church, school, and corporation lands, above 60,000 were granted to the native Irish, and the remaining 240,000 were disposed of to the British undertakers or colonists, *the majority of whose tenants were also Irish*, the original inhabitants of Ulster."—*Hist. of Presb. Church in Ireland*, i. 90, *note.*

their forefathers. But all social revolutions involve personal losses or humiliations; and no candid investigator will pronounce the Plantation of Ulster either such a dire calamity, or such a nefarious spoliation, as it has been sometimes represented.[1] Ireland had for centuries acknowledged the supremacy of the British Crown; its nobles had from generation to generation pledged their fidelity by oaths of allegiance; and the chiefs, whose estates were forfeited, only paid the penalty awarded to perjury and treason.[2] They had been joined in rebellion by their vassals; and it is probable that every one who now lost his property had in some way compromised himself.[3] By the wars which had long disturbed Ulster, parts of it had been miserably desolated, and left almost without inhabitants. It was on these deserted territories[4] that many of the colonists were planted. The natives were permitted to share in their possession, when the privilege could be conceded without detriment or danger to the new settlers.[5] The counties to which the confiscated estates be-

---

[1] Mr. Hill, in his recent work on the *Macdonnells of Antrim*, has been so misguided as to assert (p. 65) that "throughout *every corner* of Ulster, with a few rare exceptions, the Irish had been swept *from all the arable lands!*" Belfast, 1873. Sir John Davys, in his letter to the Earl of Salisbury, dated Nov. 8, 1610, giving an account of the proceedings of the Commissioners relative to the Plantation, says:—"*First*, the land assigned to the *natives*, we distributed among the *natives*, in different quantities and portions, according to their different qualities and deserts." It thus appears that natives received special consideration.

[2] "Tyrone, Tyrconnel, Maguire, and O'Dogherty," says the Roman Catholic O'Conor, "had *repeatedly violated* their oaths of allegiance."—*Hist. Address*, Part ii. 296. See, for proof, Fynes Moryson's *History of Ireland*, vol. ii. 303-5; vol. i. 21, 22, 23, 39, 40.

[3] In the Act of Attainder, passed by the Irish Parliament, nearly thirty other names are mentioned along with those of Tyrone, Tyrconnel, and Sir Cahir O'Dogherty, and it is expressly stated that they had all "been indicted, and by process of outlawry attainted, *according to the course of the common laws of the realm.*" See 11th, 12th and 13th of James I., chap. iv. For an account of their indictment see *Calendar of State Papers*, 1606-8, p. 343.

[4] Sir John Davys, in his letter to the Earl of Salisbury, dated November 1610, says: "*Half their land* doth now lie waste." The Lord Deputy declares that "the fugitives' countries are utterly more depopulated and poor than ever before for many hundred years."—*Calendar of State Papers*, 1606-8, p. 276.

[5] Sir John Davys, who was at this time Irish Attorney-General, and who was well acquainted with all the circumstances of the Plantation, says: "His Majesty did not utterly exclude the natives out of this Plantation . . . . but made a mixed

longed were amongst the smallest or the most thinly-populated in the province; and the lands planted with English and Scottish settlers did not amount to one-fourth of their area.[1] The Plantation, therefore, properly so called, extended over only a mere fraction of the north of Ireland.[2] But its success, as a political experiment, is unquestionable. The strangers introduced a new style of living and new modes of husbandry; developed the capabilities of the soil; and soon changed the face of the country. The Plantation exerted an influence far beyond its own limits: Protestantism was firmly rooted in the province; and the "cold north," which so often before had been the haunt of famine and the hotbed of rebellion, has ever since been the abode of plenty, and the stronghold of attachment to British connection.

To the great mass even of the Roman Catholics of the Province, the Plantation of Ulster was a special blessing. The native tillers of the soil now attained a position they had never enjoyed before. In the days of old Irish chieftainship their condition was truly wretched.[3] They were little, if at

---

plantation of British and Irish, that they might grow together in one nation. Only the Irish were in some places *transplanted from the woods and mountains into the plains and open countries*, that being removed, like wild fruit-trees, they might grow the milder and bear the better and sweeter fruit."—*Historical Relations*, p. 58. Dublin, 1704. It is obvious from this that the natives shared some of the best land.

[1] Mr. Froude has put the case even too strongly when he says (*The English in Ireland*, vol. i., p. 69) that out of two million acres "the *half-million* acres of *fertile* land were settled with families of Scotch and English Protestants." See the statement of Dr. O'Conor, before, p. 483, *note* (2) and preceding note.

[2] Immediately after the flight of the Earls, the Lord Deputy and Council issued a Proclamation "to assure the inhabitants of Tyrone and Tyrconnel that they would not be disturbed in the peaceable possession of their lands so long as they demeaned themselves as dutiful subjects."—*Calendar of State Papers*, James I., 1606-8, p. 263. The Lords of the Council in England commended Chichester for so doing. *Ibid.* p. 287. This engagement seems to have been faithfully observed.

[3] The great mass of the people of Ireland in ancient times had very few political privileges. They could neither act as jurors, nor appear as witnesses, nor inherit property. See O'Curry's *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Irish*, by Sullivan, i. cix. cxviii. The *Fuidir* "did not recover *Dire* (damages) for the murder of his son, daughter, or mother, nor *Eraic* (fine), nor could he inherit the property of his father or other relatives: all these went to the lord."—*Ibid.* i. cxviii. Spenser, writing towards the close of the reign of Elizabeth, states (*View of the State of Ireland*, p. 133) that the landlords "used most shamefully to rack their tenants,

all, better than slaves. They were completely at the mercy of the chiefs; they might be removed from one district to another at the pleasure of their lords;[1] or, if not sufficiently obsequious, they might be expelled from the territory altogether. They had no encouragement to erect comfortable dwellings, or plant gardens or orchards, or pursue any settled course of husbandry; for they could not tell how soon they might be driven out of possession. Hence it was that they lived in miserable hovels scarcely fit for the habitation of cattle; and that the country from generation to generation exhibited no signs of improvement. Though the farming class led a life of drudgery, they had almost nothing they could call their own. They were marked with a brand of social degradation. They were not permitted to engage in warfare—for the profession of arms was deemed quite too honourable for husbandmen;[2] they were tenants at will; they were kept in poverty by frequent robberies, in addition to the payment of rent and cesses; and, at any time, the idle Kernes and Gallow-glasses were at liberty to come among them, and, like locusts, to devour their substance. Before this period Ulster could never boast of—

"A bold peasantry, their country's pride;"

---

laying upon them *Coigny* and *Livery* at pleasure, and exacting of them (besides his covenants) what he pleaseth." Sullivan adds that, in the time of Spenser, "very many of the original chieftains had been dispossessed, and the new foreign landlords found it more to their interest . . . . to treat *all* the occupiers of their estates as *Fuidirs*" (serfs). He says farther:—"That *many Irish lords* also imitated them, and disregarded the rights of their clansmen, when there was no longer any means available to the tenant to compel their *Flaths* (landlords) to do them justice, is doubtless equally true."—O'Curry's *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Irish*, by Sullivan, i. cxxvi. In another place the same writer informs us that formerly in Ireland there were *several classes* "who possessed either very few rights, or occupied so low a position in the social scale as to have been practically in *a state of complete servitude*."—*Ibid.* i. cxv. See vol. i. of this work, p. 109, *note* (5), Book i. c. v.

[1] *Calendar of Carew Manuscripts*, by Brewer and Bullen. Introd. xiv. xx. xxviii., *note*.

[2] See Book i., chap. viii., p. 217, *note* (1). Sir John Davys says that before this time "there was no care taken of the inferior septs of people," and adds that they "were but tenants at will, or rather tenants in villenage, and were neither fit to be sworn on juries, nor to perform any public service."—*Historical Relations*, p. 57.

for those who followed the plough could not lift up their heads like free-born subjects, or assert the same rights as those who were known as "swordsmen." But, under the new *régime,* the cultivators of the soil had the benefit of equal laws;[1] they were protected in the enjoyment of their property; and the landlord could not tamper with the rights of his tenantry. To secure their independence they must have leases of the lands they occupied. According to the Articles of the Plantation, the natives who obtained from the Crown grants in fee-hold were required to pledge themselves to "*make certain estates to their undertenants* with reservation of certain rents," and to "take no Irish exactions."[2] The ordinary lease was for twenty-one years or three lives;[3] but a greater number of years were often sought and conceded.[4]

The Plantation of Ulster was unquestionably a most disagreeable arrangement to the vagabond "gentlemen" of the North, who lived by their swords, and who were the hangers-on of the great dynasts. These Kernes and Gallow-glasses subsisted by exacting free quarters and by rapine;[5] and, when

---

[1] "The common people were taught by the Justices of Assize," says Davys, who was himself one of these judges, "that they were free subjects to the Kings of England, and not slaves and vassals to their pretended lords—that the cuttings, cosheries, cessings, and other extortions of the lords were unlawful, and that they should not any more submit themselves thereunto."—*Hist. Rel.*, p. 56. He states in another place, that the first "visitation" of the judges on circuit, "though it were somewhat distasteful to the Irish lords, was *sweet and most welcome to the common people;* who, albeit they were rude and barbarous, yet they quickly apprehended the difference between the tyranny and oppression, under which they lived before, and the just government and protection which we promised unto them for the time to come."—*Hist. Rel.*, p. 55.

[2] *Calendar of Carew MSS.*, by Brewer and Bullen, pp. 52, 62. London, 1873.

[3] *Ibid.* Appendix to Introd. xlix.

[4] Thus we read of large districts leased for sixty-one years. *Calendar*, p. 423.

[5] Spenser, in his *View of the State of Ireland* (p. 228), tells us that "almost all the Irish boast themselves to be gentlemen." If the Irishman, says he, "can derive himself from the head of any sept . . . . then he holdeth himself a gentleman, and thereupon scorneth to work, or use any hard labour, which, he saith, is the life of a peasant or churl." About this time it was proposed that the Irish Parliament should pass an Act "against all such as calling themselves gentlemen, horsemen, or kerne, live loosely and freely, without any certain means or trade of life."—*Calendar of Carew MSS.*, p. 157. In February 1605, the Irish Lord Deputy and Council issued a Proclamation for the disarming the Kernes, in which

the supremacy of the law was everywhere established, their occupation was gone. But Government was not now unmindful of their necessitous condition. To encourage some to enlist in foreign service, it proposed to supply them with an outfit; and, for others, it endeavoured to provide settlements on certain waste lands in Munster.[1] But many sullenly refused to give up their predatory habits; and these dangerous classes continued, for upwards of another generation, as a social nuisance—keeping all around them in unhealthy excitement by their raids and conspiracies.

Though the undertakers, servitors, and natives—who obtained the forfeited estates—were bound to give leases to their undertenants, not a few of them sought to evade the obligation. When, several years afterwards, an inquiry was made by public authority, it was discovered that, in many cases, this condition was still unfulfilled. By no class was it so generally neglected as by the native proprietors.[2] But the fact that it was among the Articles of the Plantation was not forgotten by the tillers of the soil; and gave them a confidence in the possession of their holdings which their landlords dared not capriciously dishonour. Under many difficulties and discouragements, the Plantation continued to prosper. Mingled with the English and Scottish settlers, the native Irish became quiet, industrious, and apparently contented. Their views were enlarged, and their self-respect cultivated. Many of them from time to time passed over into the ranks of Protestantism.[3] The tenant-right of Ulster, originating in the

---

they are described as having "committed many extortions, murders, robberies, and other outrages." This Proclamation may be found in Meehan's *Fate and Fortunes of O'Neill and Tyrconnel*. Appendix, pp. 544-6.

[1] *Calendar of Carew MSS.* Introd. xli. 49. London, 1873.

[2] Thus, in Pynnar's *Survey*, made in 1618 and 1619, we read again and again, in his reports relative to the native proprietors, such entries as the following:—"Has made *no estates* to his tenants. . . . Has made *no estates* to his tenants, and all plough by the tail." Pynnar tells us that, at a place called Haberdashers' Hall, "there were nominated to him six freeholders, who were in Scotland, and these set down but for small quantities; and twenty-one lease-holders, but *not one could shew anything in writing* for estates; nor landlords, any counterpanes." He had evidently been instructed to inquire particularly whether the landlords had fulfilled the obligations into which they had entered by granting leases to their tenantry.

[3] In the days of the Plantation, Protestants were only a small fraction of the

days of the Plantation, at length grew into a claim which the lords of the soil found it impossible to ignore; and, in our own times, has pointed the way to legislation fitted at once to conserve the ownership of property, and to increase the independence of the farming population all over Ireland.

The Established Church was not neglected in the Plantation: and an ample allowance of lands was set apart for the benefit of its ministers. In the county of Armagh two thousand four hundred acres were allotted to its Primate; and four thousand six hundred and fifty, as glebes to its incumbents.[1] In other counties it enjoyed an equally liberal provision. In the appointments to the bishoprics and benefices of Ulster, the claims of the king's own countrymen were fully appreciated. In 1605 George Montgomery, a native of North Britain, was invested with the charge of no less than three Sees—Derry, Clogher, and Raphoe. There had been hitherto no Protestant prelates in these dioceses;[2] and their new overseer exhibited but little interest in their welfare; as he did not make his appearance within their borders for upwards of two years after his consecration.[3] On his promotion to Meath in 1610, he resigned Raphoe; and Andrew Knox, who had previously been Bishop of Orkney, became his successor in that diocese. About the same time James Dundas, a Scotchman, was made Bishop of Down and Connor;[4] and, soon

---

inhabitants of Ulster; they are now the majority. The offspring of the chiefs, as well as of others, have, to some extent, left the Church of Rome. Many of the Ulster Protestants at this day, named O'Neill, Macneill, Macdonnel, O'Hara, Macmahon, Maguire, Macrory, Killen, Murphy, McLaughlin, Dogherty, &c., are evidently descended from native Irish ancestors. A considerable number seem to have passed over to Protestantism at the time of the Plantation. Thus Pynnar reports, when speaking of the "Precinct of Dungannon": "There are thirty-six Irish which come to the church;" and again, when mentioning the property of Sir Oliver St. John: "Nine Irish families . . . . come to church."

[1] Harris's *Hibernica*, p. 119.

[2] The case of Miler Magrath, who was appointed to Clogher in 1570, can scarcely be considered an exception, as he was only nominally the diocesan, and that but for a short period. See Cotton's *Fasti*, iii. 77, 78.

[3] Mant, i. 356.

[4] His immediate predecessor was John Todd, a conforming priest, who had previously been a Jesuit. He succeeded to the three Sees of Down, Connor, and Dromore in 1607. His conduct soon became so intolerable that he found it necessary to resign these preferments; and, being afterwards thrown into prison in London, he poisoned himself. See Ware's *Bishops of Down and Connor*.

after his demise in 1612, Robert Echlin, another minister from North Britain, was advanced to the vacant dignity.

The Established Church of Scotland was at this period in an abnormal condition. A species of episcopacy had been thrust on it by the Crown; but little change had been made in its forms of worship; and the great bulk of its ministers remained attached to Presbyterianism. The Scotchmen who obtained bishoprics in Ulster were not disposed to contend very strenuously for the peculiarities of English prelacy; and when some of their countrymen objected to be admitted to the ministry according to the ritual of the Book of Common Prayer, Echlin and Knox yielded to their scruples, and joined in acts of Presbyterian ordination.[1]. It thus, too, happened that, in the beginning of the sixteenth century, Protestantism in the North of Ireland did not present the appearance of a rigid uniformity. Many of those who took part in the Plantation were from North Britain; and though they obtained a share of the forfeited estates, and even settled on the Church lands,[2] their nonconformity was overlooked—provided they were known to be earnest Protestants, and faithful to the interests of the British Sovereign. Not a few of the Scottish ministers, when admitted to benefices in Ulster, and when surrounded by their own countrymen, appear to have conducted worship nearly in the same way as that to which they had been accustomed in their native land[3]—though, on special occasions, they may have deemed it expedient to use at least a portion of the Liturgy. The Act of Uniformity passed in the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth required adherence to the English Service Book; but, as we have seen, most of its provisions had remained, to some extent, a dead letter; no Convocation of the Irish Protestant Church had yet been

---

[1] See Adair's *Narrative*. Introd. xiv. Leland, ii. 481.

[2] To the present day Presbyterians are in great numbers found on the Church lands. Thus a large portion of the parish of Raphoe is still held by Presbyterians. This may probably be ascribed to the liberal spirit of old Bishop Knox.

[3] Reid's *Hist. of Presb. Church in Ireland*, i. 94. Even after the adoption of the Irish canons in 1634, it appears from the correspondence of Leslie, Bishop of Down and Connor, that a large number of the clergy of his diocese very partially conformed to the English Prayer Book. See Reid, i. 243-5.

held, and no canons for its regulation were yet in existence. Hence the bishops and rectors acted very much according to their discretion.

The first Parliament held in Ireland, which can be considered as anything like a representation of the various interests of the country, assembled in 1613. No meeting of the Colonial Legislature had been convened for seven-and-twenty years; and the Lower House had hitherto consisted almost exclusively of delegates connected with the narrow limits of the Pale. All the counties of all the four provinces, as well as a large array of boroughs, now sent deputies to the Supreme Council. Romish and Protestant members were present in nearly equal numbers;[1] but the Papal party were by no means content with its composition; for they considered that, by conferring corporate privileges on many petty towns, or rather villages, in Ulster,[2] Government had given an undue preponderance to the adherents of the Reformed faith. Had it been proposed to rule the country on a strictly representative system, their objections would have been unanswerable. But, under existing circumstances, such a theory of government could not have been put into operation without peril to imperial interests. In an Irish Parliament thus constituted the Roman Catholic element—if submissive to the will of the Pope, an avowed enemy to the British Crown—must have been possessed of overwhelming and disastrous influence. It was therefore deemed prudent to make the arrangements now adopted, and thus counteract the dangers incurred by enlarging the basis of representation. The new constitution of the House of Commons was created, not by an Act of the Legislature, but simply by the power of the royal prerogative; and the safeguards provided, though awkward and invidious, were found to be effectual. Though Roman Catholics still formed

[1] The numbers returned amounted to 232. Of these, six were absent; of the remainder, 125 were Protestants, and 101 Romanists. Leland, ii. 447.

[2] In 1613 Belfast was represented for the first time. The other towns or villages in Ulster which returned members to this Parliament were Armagh, Charlemont, Antrim, Carrickfergus, Coleraine, Cavan, Belturbet, N. Limavaddy, Donegal, Derry, Lifford, Ballyshannon, Downpatrick, Newry, Bangor, Killileagh, Newtonards, Enniskillen, Monaghan, Clogher, Dungannon, and Strabane.

a vast majority of the gentry as well as of the people of Ireland, their representatives, to their great mortification, soon found themselves outvoted. Disgusted with the proceedings, they withdrew in a body; and the administration, unable to proceed with business, were obliged to resort to a prorogation. After a long interval Parliament re-assembled; and, in the end, under the able management of the Lord Deputy Chichester, the minority became more tractable. A bill confirming the attainders of the rebel chiefs was passed by the Commons unanimously;[1] and supplies, to meet the expenses of government, were cheerfully conceded.

In 1615, when Parliament was sitting, a Convocation of the clergy met in Dublin. This ecclesiastical convention—the first of the kind held in Ireland since the Reformation—signalized itself by the adoption of a Confession of Faith for the use of the Protestant Establishment. The divine entrusted with the compilation of this important symbol was the celebrated James Ussher. When speaking of the opening of the University of Dublin, he has been already mentioned as one of its earliest students. When only thirteen years of age he entered on his collegiate course.[2] He was taught to read by two aunts, both of whom had been blind from infancy.[3] These relatives, who were eminently pious, had memories of such tenacity that they could repeat a large portion of the Bible; and the mind of their youthful pupil was soon richly stored with the treasures of the holy volume. When a mere boy, Ussher was brought under deep religious impressions; and, throughout life, he maintained the character of a man of undoubted and consistent godliness. During his university career he had distinguished himself by his superior talents, as well as his unremitting application. When but a youth of eighteen, he ventured to encounter Henry Fitz-Symonds, a

---

[1] Leland, ii. 456. The fact that a Parliament, consisting to a large extent of Romanists, *unanimously* passed this bill, attests the general conviction as to the guilt of the Earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnel. The Romish prelates were exceedingly dissatisfied with the parliamentary conduct of their nobility and gentry on this occasion. See Renehan's *Collections*, p. 396.

[2] He was born January 4th, 1581.

[3] Elrington's *Life of Ussher*, p. 1.

learned Jesuit, in a public disputation on the questions debated between Romanists and Protestants. Fitz-Symonds was an able and acute polemic; and he had acquired such notoriety, by his zeal as an advocate of Popery, that he had been apprehended by order of Government and confined in the Castle of Dublin. He does not appear to have been kept in very rigorous custody, for he was permitted to invite Protestants to enter with him into controversy; but he was deemed such a formidable champion that some difficulty was experienced in finding anyone willing to accept his challenge. Ussher was induced to confront him; and he acquitted himself with such dexterity and skill that, after two or three conferences, the Jesuit withdrew from the arena.[1] This affair had probably some influence in shaping his future line of study; for, some time afterwards, he commenced a laborious examination of the works of the Christian Fathers. For eighteen years he was employed in this herculean task.[2] Every day he devoted so many hours to the perusal; and he thus, in the end, became more extensively and profoundly acquainted with patristic literature than perhaps any other theologian of the seventeenth century. When he entered on public life, ecclesiastical order was not very strictly observed—even in the high places of the Church. Before he was admitted to the lowest office of the ministry, he was permitted to preach on the Romish controversy in one of the Dublin cathedrals in presence of the members of the Irish Government;[3] and, when only twenty-one years of age, he was ordained deacon and priest on the same day.[4]

At the time of the meeting of the Convocation in 1615 Ussher was Professor of Divinity in Dublin College; and the creed which he now prepared for the use of the Irish Church

[1] Elrington, p. 12.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 9. By the Fathers we are here to understand all the ecclesiastical writers extending down to the thirteenth century.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 18.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 19. It appears that Elrington and his other biographers have erroneously dated these two ordinations "on the Sunday before Christmas in the year 1601." The original letters of his orders have recently come to light, and they attest that the ordinations took place on a certain day in May 1602. See Cotton's *Fasti*, v. 198, 199.

is a fair sample of his theology. It consists of one hundred and four Articles divided into nineteen sections, and is thoroughly evangelical.[1] It sets forth with great distinctness those views of the divine decrees so lucidly propounded by the great Reformer of Geneva; and declares that "the godlike consideration of Predestination and our election in Christ is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, and such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ."[2] It teaches that the Scriptures "are able to instruct sufficiently in all points" of doctrine and duty; and that we are justified by faith without "our own works or merits." It makes no mention of the three orders of bishops, priests, and deacons; and it ignores the necessity for episcopal ordination.[3] It asserts farther that the Lord's Day "is *wholly* to be dedicated unto the service of God;" and that the Bishop of Rome is "that Man of Sin foretold in the Holy Scriptures, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth and abolish with the brightness of his coming." The famous Articles of Lambeth, exhibiting the distinctive features of Calvinism, are introduced, almost word for word, into this Confession. Appended to it is a decree of the Convocation ordaining that "if any minister, of what degree or quality soever he be," shall "publicly teach any doctrine contrary to these Articles," and if, after due admonition, he does not conform and cease to disturb the peace of the Church, he shall be "silenced and deprived of all spiritual promotions."

This elaborate formulary, when adopted, was signed by Jones, Archbishop of Dublin, Speaker of the House of Bishops in Convocation, and Lord Chancellor of Ireland; by the Prolocutor of the other House of the clergy in their names; and by the Lord-Deputy Chichester in the name of the Sovereign.[4]

---

[1] These Articles may be found published in various forms; but as they are of special importance in connection with the ecclesiastical history of Ireland, and as they may not be known to many readers, they have been appended to this volume. See Appendix III.

[2] Art. 16.

[3] See Collier's *Ecc. Hist. of Great Britain*, vii. 381. London, 1840.

[4] Elrington's *Life of Ussher*, p. 49. It has been often remarked that the Westminster Confession of Faith, drawn up about thirty years afterwards, is to a great extent modelled after this Irish formulary. "In the order and titles of many

It has indeed been questioned whether it was ever submitted to the Irish Legislature; and, on the presumption that such an oversight occurred, its authority has been challenged; but, as Parliament was sitting, it is quite possible that even this form was not neglected, though we have no positive proof of its observance. It is certain that, at the time, the Articles were understood to possess the highest sanction which the State could confer on them. In some points they present a marked contrast to the Articles of the Church of England, as they distinctly enunciate principles then identified with Puritanism. There is reason to believe that their adoption as the creed of the Established Church induced ministers from Scotland to settle in Ireland.[1] King James had long before been endeavouring to set up prelacy in North Britain; and though the scheme was unpopular, he could not be induced to desist from its prosecution. In consequence, a number of the more resolute Presbyterian clergy were driven from their Scottish parishes. Some of these earnest men had already crossed the Channel, and had been permitted to officiate according to their own forms in the Church of Ireland. In 1613 Edward Brice, who had formerly been minister of Drymen, in Stirlingshire, and who had refused to acknowledge Spotiswood, Archbishop of Glasgow, as permanent Moderator of the Synod of Clydesdale, became incumbent of Broad-island, near Carrickfergus, in the county of Antrim.[2] He was

of its chapters, as well as in the language of whole sections or subdivisions of chapters, and in many single phrases and *voces signatæ* occurring throughout their Confession, the Westminster divines . . . . have followed very closely in the footsteps of Ussher and his Irish brethren. The headings of those chapters which cannot be clearly traced to this source may generally be found in a *Body of Divinity*, which was published in his [Ussher's] name, while the [Westminster] Assembly was sitting, and which, though he declined to sanction it as a statement of his own opinions, he admitted that he had, in early life, compiled from the writings of others."—PROFESSOR MITCHELL's Introduction to *Minutes of the Sessions of the Westminster Assembly of Divines*, xlvii. Edinburgh and London, 1874.

[1] It has been absurdly asserted by Irish Unitarians that the founders of Irish Presbyterianism "entered on their work on the strictest principles of *non-subscription*." See Crozier's *Life of Dr. Montgomery*, i. 67. The very contrary is the fact. The creed drawn up in 1615 encouraged them to settle in the country; for it inculcated that Calvinistic theology of which they were all the strenuous advocates. See also vol. ii. of this work, Book iv. chap. ii.

[2] Reid's *Hist. of Presb. Church in Ireland*, i. 98.

subsequently promoted by his countryman, Bishop Echlin, to be Prebendary of Kilroot in the same neighbourhood.[1] He neither used the Liturgy nor renounced any of his former principles; but, in the dearth of suitable pastors, his nonconformity was tolerated; so that he continued till his death, upwards of twenty years afterwards, to preach in the parish church, and to enjoy the tithes of the benefice. He was the first of a band of worthies who settled in Ulster, and who laid the foundations of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. In 1615 Robert Cunningham, a man of kindred spirit, was admitted by Echlin as minister of Holywood. In 1623 Robert Blair, who had been regent or lecturer in the College of Glasgow, and who had been obliged to resign his situation because of his opposition to prelacy, removed to Bangor, in County Down. He was recognized as a clergyman by the Bishop of Down and Connor under very peculiar circumstances. When about to undertake the pastoral care, he intimated to the diocesan that he could not conscientiously submit to prelatic ordination. Echlin replied: "Whatever you account of episcopacy, I know you account a Presbytery to have divine warrant: will you not receive ordination from Mr. Cunningham [of Holywood] and the adjacent brethren, and let me come in among them in no other relation than a presbyter?" Blair could not object to this arrangement, and thus he was invested with the pastoral commission.[2]

It is noteworthy that the section of the Northern Province in which Protestantism became eventually most firmly rooted, did not form any portion of the six counties planted under royal supervision. Con O'Neill, the proprietor of large tracts in Down and Antrim, having lost his liberty and forfeited his lands by rebellion,[3] consented to surrender two-thirds of his inheritance on condition of having his title to the rest confirmed,[4] and of being delivered from imprisonment. Mr. Hugh Montgomery, of Braidstone, in Scotland, and Mr. James

---

[1] Cotton's *Fasti*, iii. 265, 266.

[2] Reid's *Hist. of Presb. Church in Ireland*, i. 103.

[3] See the *Montgomery MSS.*, edited by the Rev. George Hill.

[4] The lands thus preserved to O'Neill constitute at present the estates of Lord O'Neill of Shanescastle.

Hamilton, one of the early Fellows of Dublin College, secured grants of the whole of this property; and, as much of it was now uninhabited, they invited their countrymen from North Britain to settle on it, and to undertake its cultivation. Sir Arthur Chichester and others, who had obtained similar grants in Antrim, also encouraged Scottish adventurers to become their tenantry. Thus, in the early part of the seventeenth century, a considerable body of emigrants from the opposite coast, encouraged by the fertility and cheapness of the land, removed to Down and Antrim. Presbyterian congregations were soon formed, and Presbyterian ministers from Scotland became their pastors. Many of the settlers were by no means the best specimens of their countrymen. At home some of them had been riotous and profane, and some of them had been obliged to leave their native land in disgrace, under the pressure of debt or the dread of prosecution; but they had the singular advantage of being instructed by able preachers, who laboured diligently to promote their spiritual improvement. The colonists, though generally poor, were hardy and intelligent; they were taught to be thrifty, industrious, and pious; and they gradually became in many districts by far the major part of the population. At the present day the Protestants of Down and Antrim form considerably more than one-third of all the Protestants of Ireland; and the Presbyterians constitute nearly the two-thirds of the Protestants of these two counties.[1]

When the adherents of the Reformed faith were securing a strong hold in the north-eastern corner of the island, the Romanists did not relax in zeal and activity. They never wanted an ample supply of candidates for the priesthood. As soon as any young native of good talent evinced a desire to devote himself to the sacred profession, he was sent abroad, and educated at some foreign seminary.[2] Hitherto a number of the Romish laity, known as *Church Papists*, had been wont, at least occasionally, to attend the established service.[3] Every

[1] According to the Government census of 1871 the Protestants of Down and Antrim amounted to 497,251, of whom 304,639 were Presbyterians, and 154,584 Episcopalians.

[2] See a letter written by Jones, the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin. Mant, i. 389.

[3] Cox, ii. 9.

effort was now made to put a stop to their modified conformity; and the practice was to a great extent discontinued when, in 1605, they were informed in a Papal Bull that it was as safe to sacrifice to idols as to be present at the reading of the Book of Common Prayer.[1] Another Bull, issued in the following year, was exceedingly embarrassing to those members of the Romish Church who were desirous to maintain their reputation as loyal subjects. It was known that they objected to the Oath of Supremacy, and the king was not unwilling to respect such scruples; but the recent discovery of the Gunpowder Plot had awakened fresh doubts as to the sincerity of their attachment to his government; and, to test their fidelity, he imagined that he could frame an oath of allegiance which, without pledging them to recognise his title as governor of the Church, would bind them with sufficient stringency to submit to his authority. He accordingly prepared a formulary in which he was acknowledged as lawful sovereign, and in which it was affirmed that the Pope had no power to depose him, or to dispose of his dominions, or to authorise any foreign prince to invade the country, or to free any of his subjects from the duty of allegiance. The oath denounced as "impious and heretical" the doctrine that princes excommunicated by the bishop of Rome were to be deposed or murdered by their subjects; and concluded with an avowal that neither the Pontiff nor any person whatever could absolve from its obligations.[2] Some Roman Catholics readily agreed to attest their loyalty by adopting this form of adjuration;[3] but it soon became known that it did not give

---

[1] Mant, i. 350. A copy of this Bull may be found in King's *Supplementary Vol.* pp. 1306-9. It is dated 7th of December, 1605; and must therefore have been issued by Paul V. In the Bull issued in 1606 this attendance on Protestant worship is again denounced.

[2] This oath may be found at length in King's *Supplementary Volume*, pp. 1311-1312. See also Burke's *Hibernia Dominicana*, p. 614.

[3] See *Columbanus ad Hibernos*, vi. 109. The Roman Catholic Archpriest Blackwell, now in England, not only took the oath himself, but also advised his co-religionists to follow his example. He was, in consequence, removed from his office as archpriest by Paul V. See Collier's *Ecc. Hist. of Great Britain*, vii. 348. The Sorbonne, notwithstanding, subsequently affirmed the lawfulness of the oath. *Ibid.*

general satisfaction. It was in the very teeth of many Bulls published by the Popes in the reign of Elizabeth; and every one possessed of ordinary candour could not but acknowledge the contradiction. The bishop of Rome, as all well knew, had of late again and again claimed the very powers here denied to him; and Paul V., who now filled the so-called chair of Peter, was not the man to abate any of the papal pretensions.[1] In a Bull, dated September 1606, he protested against the royal formulary, stating that the oath it embodied could not be taken with safety to the Catholic faith and to the welfare of the soul; and that it contained much that was "openly opposed to salvation."[2] When this manifesto appeared, a number of the more moderate Romanists were disposed to challenge it as a document which had in some way been surreptitiously obtained—alleging that the head of their Church could not have given it his solemn sanction. But Paul quickly set their doubts at rest. In a second Bull, dated September 1607, he acknowledged it as genuine; and averred that it had been written "after long and grave deliberation on all the matters therein contained."[3]

Whilst the Pope was warning his adherents against this oath of allegiance, he did not venture to state distinctly the real difficulty which lay at the root of his objections. Contenting himself with general expressions—such as saying that the taking of it was dangerous to the faith or opposed to salvation—he did his utmost to prevent the Roman Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland from thus pledging their fidelity to the English monarch. He still cherished the idea that he had a right to set up and depose kings; and he saw that the royal formulary gave the lie to all such pretensions.[4] He did

[1] This Pontiff, who occupied the Roman See from 1605 to 1621, was remarkable for his cruel and overbearing spirit. On a memorable occasion he excommunicated the Venetians.

[2] This Bull may be found in Burke's *Hibernia Dominicana*, pp. 613 615. See also King's *Supplementary Volume*, pp. 1314-1317.

[3] See Burke's *Hibernia Dominicana*, p. 615, and King's *Supplementary Volume*, pp. 1318-1320.

[4] The late Dr. Doyle, Roman Catholic Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, says candidly:—"I believe the experiments made in the seventeenth century, to array the orthodoxy of subjects against their sovereigns *taught the Court of Rome to form*

not, in fact, wish that the members of his Church should take any oath of allegiance to a Protestant sovereign. Passing events proved that the exacting of an oath was but a poor safeguard against imposture and jesuitism. About this time a priest, named Robert Lalor—appointed by the sovereign Pontiff to the high office of Vicar-general in the three dioceses of Dublin, Kildare, and Ferns—had in some way attracted the notice of government; and had, in consequence, been committed to prison. When indicted for upholding foreign jurisdiction within the realm, he promptly submitted to the court, and voluntarily declared, on oath, that he was not a lawful vicar-general; that the king was supreme governor in all cases, as well ecclesiastical as civil; and that no bishop made by the Pope had any power to impugn or disannul any act done by any prelate appointed by his Majesty's authority.[1] This confession was so satisfactory to his judges that they were disposed to set him at liberty; but it meanwhile transpired that he had been basely equivocating; and it was discovered that, to his own party, he had disavowed his retractation. Government in consequence resolved to try him under the statute of Præmunire passed in the reign of Richard II.—[2] with a view to convince the public that the bishop of Rome now arrogated an authority which even a Roman Catholic parliament before the Reformation disowned and repudiated. When arraigned, Lalor's recantation was read in presence of a crowded audience; and when asked, if he had not denied it, he attempted to escape by pleading that he had owned the king's supremacy in *ecclesiastical*, not in *spiritual* matters.[3]

---

a just estimate of their power in this respect. . . . The truth is, that Popes who would *now* interfere in such matters would become the laughing-stock of Europe." —*Letters on the State of Ireland*, by J. K. L. Letter viii., p. 254. Dublin, 1825. Dr. Doyle evidently did not believe in the doctrine of Papal Infallibility.

[1] Cox, ii. pp. 10-11; Leland, ii. 422. This oath was voluntarily made on the 22nd of December, 1606. See Cox. *Ibid.*

[2] 16th of Richard II., chap. 5.

[3] "In Lalor's *Recognition*," says Dr. O'Conor, "the word *ecclesiastical* is designedly substituted for *spiritual;* because the latter was offensive to the Catholics, as implying spiritual power, strictly so called, which, being of *divine institution*, is confined exclusively to the Church."—*Historical Address*, part ii. 271-2. "Lalor was justly prosecuted, not persecuted, on the Catholic Statute of Præmunire,

The knavery which dictated this sophistical distinction was fully exposed; he was pronounced guilty; but he had already rendered himself so contemptible in the eyes of all men by his cowardice and falsehood, that the State seems to have declined to press the prosecution farther.[1] Lalor was not the only Roman Catholic priest who sought to escape the penalties of the law by the same system of scheming and perjury.

After the appearance in 1605 of the proclamation for the banishment of the Roman Catholic clergy—which, as we have seen, was disregarded—they were permitted to remain for some years without disturbance.[2] There are good grounds for believing that, about this period, a considerable change for the better took place in their general character. We read no longer, as in former times, of the illegitimate children of the bishops; of priests so frequently living in open fornication; or of friars everywhere trampling on all the rules of propriety and decency. Protestantism had, no doubt, an important share in bringing about this improvement. It was felt that if Popery, in presence of a rival system, were to maintain its position in the country, its official representatives must not be shamefully immoral; and measures were therefore taken to keep its clergy under stricter supervision. In February 1614, a synod convened by David Rothe, Vicar-general of Armagh and subsequently Roman Catholic bishop of Ossory, assembled at Drogheda; and sat for several days in delibera-

---

enacted in the Catholic reign of Richard II. for the security of a Catholic state." *Ibid.* p. 265.

[1] Dr. Moran affirms that "in a few days" he was "added to the *martyrs* of Dublin," and quotes Cox as his authority for this statement. *Archbishops of Dublin*, p. 220. Cox states directly the reverse. "The sentence of the law," says he, "was *never executed against him* that I can find."—Cox, *Hibernia Anglicana*, second part, p. 11. ed. 1690. Dr. O'Conor expressly states "the sentence was *never executed*."—*Historical Address*, part ii., p. 266. The Roman Catholic Bishop of Ossory is singularly given to blundering.

[2] See O'Conor's *Historical Address*, part ii., p. 260. Fynes Moryson, writing about 1613, intimates that the priests in Munster could set the government at defiance: "In which parts," says he, "the very numbers of the priests, swarming among them, and being active men, yea, contrary to their profession, *bloody in handling the sword, far exceeded the number of the King's soldiers*, reduced to very small or no strength."—*History of Ireland*, vol. ii., p. 253. Dublin, 1735. Moryson had been secretary to the Lord Deputy Mountjoy.

tion. It must have been pretty numerously attended, as it is said to have consisted of vicars-general, rural deans, professors of divinity, canonists, and fathers of the religious orders of Cistercians, Franciscans, Jesuits and others.[1] Rothe, who presided, was credulous and narrow-minded; but he was not destitute of theological learning; he was an earnest and devout Romanist; and he seems to have dictated the regulations adopted on the occasion. Its statutes, which are extant,[2] illustrate the condition of Romanism in Ulster about the middle of the reign of James I. In the preamble it is stated that "all the suffragan sees in the province" were then vacant,[3] and that the synod had been summoned to draw up "rules and constitutions for the better government of the clergy and people." The peculiar tenets of Romanism are here broadly asserted. The glorious doctrine of a free pardon through faith in an atoning High Priest is ignored; and the sinner is taught to look to himself for salvation. "Confessors are bound," say these statutes of Drogheda, "to teach their penitents the difference between *contrition* which is a sorrow for sin, as the greatest evil, because it offends God . . . and *attrition*, which is a sorrow for sin because it deserves hell . . . This attrition, elicited with God's grace, with a firm purpose of sinning no more, *suffices*, with sacramental absolution, *to obtain justification* and the remission of sin."[4] It was agreed at this meeting that the vicars-general—who acted as substitutes for the bishops—should select the parish priests for

[1] Renehan's *Collections*, p. 428.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 142-6; 427-37.

[3] At this time Ireland had four R. C. archbishops, viz: Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Armagh, who was appointed in 1601 and died in 1625; Eugene Matthews, Archbishop of Dublin, who was appointed in 1611 and died in 1623; David Kearney, Archbishop of Cashel, who was appointed about 1604 and died in 1625; and Florence Conry, Archbishop of Tuam, who was appointed in 1608 and died in 1629. See Renehan, pp. 21, 23, 187, 189, 261, 271, 396, 401. Lombard and Conry were constantly non-resident.

[4] Renehan, p. 431. How different is this theology from that of the Apostle Paul! "Therefore we conclude," says the Apostle, "that a man is *justified by faith* without the deeds of the law." Rom. iii. 28. "To him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that *justifieth the ungodly*, his faith is counted for righteousness." Rom. iv. 5. "Being *justified by faith* we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." Rom. v. 1.

the several dioceses; and that the secular clergy should frequently invite members of the monastic orders, as well as others noted for zeal and learning, "to preach, catechise, and assist in the better performance of ecclesiastical offices."[1] Scandal, it seems, had been created by the way in which the clergy had long made themselves prominent in politics; and much inconvenience had resulted from the indiscretion of some of these popular agitators. The ordinary parish priests were now forbidden to meddle with such matters. They "must avoid carefully, both in public and private, the discussion of state affairs and temporal government."[2] Nor must they secularize themselves by undertaking the management of house-property, or by acting as stewards, land agents, or accountants.[3] They must shun the company of heretics and all controversy with them; and they must avoid taverns and refrain from gambling.[4] The Synod of Drogheda resolved farther not to insist on the introduction of the Gregorian Calendar. "As a fearful change," say they, "has taken place in this province . . . especially since the arrival of the new Scotch and English settlers, . . . we are now called upon to consider what is more expedient amidst this variety of customs and tribes; particularly as in other provinces of Ireland almost all the Catholics retain the ancient method of reckoning time and their old usages."[5]

Shortly after the meeting of this Synod of Drogheda another ecclesiastical convention of the same description assembled at Kilkenny. Owen MacMahon,[6] the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, presided; and its sittings extended from the 22nd to the 27th of June inclusive.[7] Its regulations closely resembled those just described; but a few of a somewhat different type may be briefly noticed. The

---

[1] King's *Supplementary Volume*, p. 895.

[2] Renehan, pp. 428-9.

[3] King's *Supplementary Volume*, p. 895.

[4] Renehan, pp. 432-3.

[5] *Ibid.* pp. 435-6.

[6] Or as he is sometimes called Eugene Matthews.

[7] Renehan, p. 187, *note*. This Synod met in 1614. The Canons of the Council of Trent are said to have been recited and published in this Synod. According to Cardinal Cullen it met in 1613. See his *Evidence in the O'Keeffe Case*, p. 387. Kirkpatrick's *Report*. London, 1874.

fourth statute of this Synod enacts that baptism is no longer to be administered by *immersion*, but by sprinkling or *affusion;* and the fifth provides that no priest, under any pretext, is to celebrate mass *twice* on the same day without special permission.[1] There must be no preaching on articles of faith, or controversy, by any but those licensed to do so by the ordinary, after an approved course of theological studies.[2] Laymen, in cases of necessity, were permitted to carry the eucharist to the dying. "The recipients, if laymen, may not touch the sacred host with their hands," but may "reverently lift it into their mouths with their tongue."[3] Superstition strangely beclouds and stultifies the intellect. Had these divines possessed any right ideas as to the nature and design of the Lord's Supper, they never could have engaged in such trivial and absurd legislation.

At a subsequent period of the reign of James I., at least two additional Roman Catholic Synods were held in Ireland, over both of which David Rothe presided.[4] Various new canons were framed by them for the improvement of ecclesiastical discipline. When these conventions assembled, Romanists apparently enjoyed considerable indulgence. The Parliament which met in 1613 enacted no fresh penal laws[5]— though, when it was called together, some such measures were anticipated. The Lord Deputy Chichester, and Knox, the Protestant Bishop of Raphoe[6]— who was now a Privy Councillor—have been blamed for their extreme severity towards

---

[1] Brenan, p. 505.

[2] D'Alton's *Archbishops of Dublin*, p. 388.

[3] Fitzpatrick's *Life, Times and Correspondence of the Right Rev. Dr. Doyle*, i. 101; Brenan, p. 506.

[4] Moran's *Memoir of Lombard*, prefixed to his *Commentarius*, lx. lxiii.

[5] O'Daly, or Dominic de Rosario, some of whose falsehoods have been already exposed, publishes a piece of penal legislation which he describes as "one of the first enactments" of this Parliament. See his *Persecution after the Geraldines*, p. 180. Dublin, 1847. The whole is a barefaced forgery. No such enactment is in the Irish statute-book.

[6] Brenan asserts that Knox "entered into a solemn engagement to *extirpate the Catholic religion in Ireland*." *Ecc. Hist.* p. 451. This writer seems to have been dreaming of the Solemn League and Covenant, framed in 1643, long after the Bishop's death. It is well known that Knox was extremely indulgent to Presbyterian non-conformists.

recusants; and in certain cases—especially where the papal party evidently exhibited a disposition to abuse their freedom[1]—it cannot be denied that government insisted on the strict enforcement of existing statutes; but it can be clearly demonstrated that those who have denounced the Deputy and the Bishop as persecutors, have been guilty of the most ridiculous exaggeration. Their tales of suffering appeared in publications circulated on the continent; and though, to persons at home acquainted with the real condition of the country, they were known to be preposterous,[2] they served to awaken the sympathy of foreign states, and to secure support for not a few Irishmen who were wandering about in France, Spain, Italy, and Germany. "Every town, city, *hamlet*, and *homestead in the island*," says one, "was visited by trained bands of perjurers, informers, and assassins, to carry out the designs of the Bishop [Knox]. . . . Girt by assassins, perjurers, and informers, the Catholics who fell into his hands on the highway, by-way, or hostelry, *had no hope of escape from death and torments*."[3] At this time the penal laws were comparatively mild: a trivial fine—seldom levied—was the punishment of nonconformity. Almost all the nobility and gentry of Ireland were members of the Church of Rome, and nearly the whole population belonged to that communion; so that such statements carry with them their own refutation. Misrepresentation in the end is almost sure to recoil upon its fabricators; and, whilst such atrocious falsehoods weakened the general credit of the narratives in which they were contained, they also greatly abated the kindly feeling which many were disposed to cherish towards conscientious recusants.

When Chichester—already created Baron of Belfast—resigned the government of Ireland, he was succeeded by Sir

[1] About this time they often came into collision with the civil power by exercising jurisdiction in a way not recognized by law. They not only dissolved marriages, but issued sentences of excommunication, which involved individuals in poverty and distress.

[2] In 1616 James declared in the Star Chamber that "he could not persecute a priest *only for religion sake;* but if he refuse to take *the oath of allegiance*, which is merely *civil*, those that so refuse it, I leave them to the law."—O'Conor's *Hist. Address*, part ii., p. 288, *note*.

[3] *Persecution after the Geraldines*, pp. 178, 180.

Oliver St. John. The new Viceroy excited the alarm of the Romanists by proceeding to enforce the penal laws with considerable vigour. Some popish priests were arrested; and all the regular clergy were commanded, by proclamation, to leave the country.[1] The conspiracies fomented by them were assigned as the cause of this severity. Magistrates and officers of justice were called on to take the Oath of Supremacy; and the recusants were summarily deprived of their commissions. Loud complaints of tyranny were now raised; and the stories of persecution, so rife in the time of Chichester, were repeated with additional exaggerations. A writer of this period reports that on one occasion, "nine hundred persons, *who refused to take the oath of supremacy*, were thrown into fetters in Dublin Castle."[2] It is notorious that the oath here spoken of was tendered *only to officials*, and that there was not room in the vice-regal prison for anything like the number of defaulters said to have been there incarcerated.[3] It was boldly alleged that the people of the small and poor county of Cavan had paid in one year the sum of *eight thousand guineas*[4] as fines for non-attendance at church; and yet it could be shown that, about the very same time, not more than from *fourteen to fifteen pounds* had been gathered in this way in the county of Dublin,[5] where the population was much larger, and where the legal penalty had been far more rigor-

[1] Leland, ii. 461.

[2] This is the statement of O'Sullivan. See Moran's *Memoir of Lombard*, prefixed to his *Commentarius*, p. lviii., and *Archbishops of Dublin*, p. 262.

[3] Cox, who seems to have read *ninety*, not nine hundred, in his copy of O'Sullivan, pronounces even this reduced number absurd. "Mr. Sullivan says . . . . he imprisoned *ninety* citizens for denying the King's supremacy, all which *is notoriously false*."—*Hib. Anglicana*, part ii., p. 33.

[4] David Rothe, in his *Analecta*, seems to have been the first to give currency to this silly tale. "Census ille mulctatitius pro constantia in religione, uno anno pertingebat ad acto millia aureorum."—*Analecta*, p. 50. Moran, apparently ashamed of the statement, has reduced the sum to eight hundred pounds. See his *Memoir of Lombard*, prefixed to his *Commentarius*, p. lix.

[5] See O'Conor's *Hist. Address*, part ii. 262: and Elrington's *Life of Ussher*, p. 21, *note*. In 1630, when the Protestants had considerably increased, they did not amount to the *one-tenth* of the population of County Cavan. See Clogy's *Life and Episcopate of Bedell*, p. 37. London, 1862. In some parishes, even in Bedell's time, there was not a single Protestant. *Ibid.* p. 89.

ously exacted. It was announced that the Roman Catholics of Ireland in one year had paid in fines for non-conformity no less than *six hundred thousand pounds*,[1]—whereas it was well known to all who had turned their attention to the subject, that this amount then exceeded the entire revenue of the kingdom![2] St. John unquestionably refused to concede to the papal party immunities which they had long enjoyed; and when the magistrates of Waterford declined, one after another, to take the Oath of Supremacy, he resorted to the extreme measure of issuing a commission to seize on the charter and revenues of the city. "This rigour," says a respectable historian, "provoked the partisans of Rome in foreign countries to inveigh against him with severity of falsehood, to charge him with enormous oppressions in exacting *fines never imposed*, and in crowding the prisons with wretched confessors of the faith, *who never suffered the restraint of a moment*."[3]

In a few years St. John ceased to hold office; and Lord Falkland was appointed to the Viceroyalty. It was understood that the new governor was authorized by the king to grant greater freedom in matters of religion than had been permitted under the rule of his predecessor. The Romanists had, in consequence, ventured to take possession of some of the established churches, and to re-occupy abbeys of which they had been deprived.[4] But the announcement of the lenient intentions of Government gave much uneasiness to the more earnest Protestants. The doctrine of toleration was yet sadly misunderstood; and when Falkland was sworn in as Lord Deputy, a sermon preached before him by the pious and

---

[1] O'Sullivan, *Cath. Hist.*, p. 335. Moran makes the sum six hundred thousand *gold crowns*. *Archbishops of Dublin*, p. 262.

[2] See O'Conor's *Hist. Address*, part ii., 261-262.

[3] Leland, ii. 462. Burke gravely tells even a more ridiculous story of these days of persecution. A Protestant bishop, we are assured, coveted a costly chasuble, which he converted into a pair of breeches; but lo! to the horror of himself and his company, when his lordship put on the metamorphosed garment, he suddenly took fire, and was burnt to death by spontaneous combustion! See the *Hibernia Dominicana*, p. 619.

[4] See instances of this in Elrington's *Life of Ussher*, p. 59.

learned Ussher—now Bishop of Meath[1]—afforded the partisans of popery only too good grounds for complaint and invective. It must be acknowledged that the Bishop's text—"He beareth not the sword in vain"[2]—was most unhappily chosen. Ussher protested that "it was far from his mind to excite the magistrate unto any violent courses" against the recusants, and that he "abhorred cruel dealings;"[3] but still he could not deny that he had urged the strict execution of the penal laws in the case of all who had ever conformed to the Established Church and then lapsed into Romanism.[4] Even Hampton, Archbishop of Armagh, a mild and prudent man, sent him a letter of remonstrance; and suggested to him the propriety of retiring from Dublin and "spending more time in his own diocese."[5] The Bishop of Meath appears to have taken the hint; for, about this period, we find him labouring diligently to promote the conversion of the Romanists under his episcopal supervision. When they expressed a wish to hear him preach, but objected to appear at church, he condescended to their scruples by addressing them in the Court House. Ussher was a most effective speaker; and his discourses soon produced such an impression that the priests became alarmed, and interdicted their congregations from listening to him in any place whatever. His conferences with the Roman Catholics of his diocese led to the production of one of his most useful and interesting works.[6] He perceived that they laid great stress on the argument drawn from the antiquity of popery—believing that they still adhered to the identical system handed down among them from the days of Saint Patrick. His intimate acquaintance with the ancient history of the Church of Ireland peculiarly qualified him for grappling with this delusion; and accordingly he soon afterwards presented to the public his "Discourse of the Religion anciently professed by the Irish and British."

---

[1] Ussher was consecrated Bishop of Meath in 1621. He was then forty years of age.

[2] Rom. xiii. 4.

[3] Elrington's *Life*, p. 59. It is said that Ussher at this time felt it necessary to preach an explanatory sermon. *Ibid.* p. 60.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 59.

[5] The letter may be found in Mant, i. 410-11.

[6] Elrington's *Life*, p. 57.

Though Ussher's sermon stirred up such bitter feelings on the part of the Romanists, it was not without influence on the Viceroy and his Council. The recusants were certainly not permitted to enjoy the immunity on which they had been calculating. In 1623 a proclamation, as severe as any yet issued, made its appearance. It commanded the popish clergy, regular and secular, to quit the country within forty days.[1] This manifesto, like others which preceded it, was disregarded. Some attempts were made to carry out its threats; but it was impossible by any such demonstration to extinguish the religion of a whole people; and its publication only produced a feeling of more bitter antipathy to Protestantism. The monks and priests knew well that they had little to fear from such an empty thunderbolt. "The more frequently they are ordered to quit the kingdom," says a contemporary Roman Catholic writer, "the more pleasure they feel in remaining there—aye, and even in flocking together into it. To avoid being observed by the English they dress themselves in the apparel of lay persons, and appear—some as merchants or medical men—some as knights, equipped with dirk and sword—others under other characters and pretences."[2]

As James advanced in life he declined in public estimation; his timidity and want of principle rendered him contemptible; and, towards the close of his reign, Ireland suffered much from arbitrary and unjust government. The most mischievous attempts were made, under legal pretences, to wrest large tracts of land from their possessors, and to place them at the disposal of the Crown. These proceedings awakened, all over the country, much alarm and indignation. It was well that the reformed faith was not compromised by such acts of misgovernment; for the system of oppression was pursued apparently without any reference to the creed of the sufferers.[3]

[1] Ware's *Annals*, A.D. 1623. At this time government is said to have ascertained that there were 1,160 priests, regular and secular, in Ireland. Haverty, p. 504, *note*.

[2] O'Sullivan, *Hist. Cath.*, tom. iv., lib. i., c. 17. O'Sullivan is a very untruthful writer; and even here he probably exaggerates. In Dublin and a few other public places, the priests may have found it necessary to assume the dresses described; but, in most parts of the country, they could still appear without disguise.

[3] Leland, ii. 467.

During the reign of this monarch Protestantism obtained a firm footing in Ireland. Though many of the Established clergy were ill qualified for the position which they occupied, they were, on the whole, greatly superior to their predecessors of the days of Elizabeth. The improvement in the general character of the hierarchy was unquestionable. The bishops were still quite too much devoted to secular affairs; and some of them were noted for their covetousness;[1] but we do not find among them the gross licentiousness which formerly disgraced the order. Hampton—who was Primate of Armagh from 1613 to 1625—has been described as "a grave and learned man;"[2] and his conduct on various occasions justifies this representation. Ussher—promoted first to the See of Meath, and, on the death of Hampton, advanced to the Primacy—would have done honour to any church in Christendom. His elevation to the archiepiscopal chair was one of the last public acts of James;[3] and had that monarch always exhibited such sagacity in the selection of those exalted to places of influence and honour, he would have been eminently entitled to the name of the British Solomon. But, throughout this reign, the great mass of the Protestant clergy were poorly fitted to advance the cause of the Reformation. Jones—who was Archbishop of Dublin from 1605 to 1619—complains that many of the ministers who came over from England[4] to hold livings in the Church were men of "dissolute lives."[5] When the Lord Deputy Chichester in 1607 visited Ulster, he discovered that the churches in County Monaghan were occupied

---

[1] Such was Robert Draper, Bishop of Kilmore and Ardagh from 1604 to 1612. Though he held these two Sees "there was no divine service or sermon to be heard within either of his dioceses."—Mant, i. 358. But he did not fail "to make benefit out of the insufficiency" of the "barbarous clergy" under his care.—*Ibid.* John Boyle, who was Bishop of Cork, Cloyne and Ross from 1618 to 1620, obtained his bishopric by paying a considerable sum for the appointment. See Brady's *Records of Cork, Cloyne and Ross*, iii. 52.

[2] Ware's *Bishops of Armagh.*

[3] His patent of translation to Armagh was dated 21st March, 1625—a few days before the King's death. Cotton, iii. 21.

[4] Jones was himself an Englishman. He held the office of Lord Chancellor from 1605 till his death. He was the ancestor of the Viscounts Ranelagh. Cotton's *Fasti*, ii. 21.

[5] Mant, i. 390.

by "popish priests, instituted by bishops authorized from Rome." "Many of them," says the reporter of the incidents of this journey, "like other old priests of Queen Mary's time, are ready to yield to conformity."[1] In the Diocese of Kilmore, according to the same witness, the incumbents at this period, "both parsons and vicars, did appear to be such poor, ragged, ignorant creatures" as could not be "esteemed worthy of the meanest livings."[2] Two or three parishes were often united, and even thus the pastoral stipend was totally inadequate; persons who had no higher literary qualification than the ability to read English or Irish were admitted to ordination; and, in many places, the parish clerk conducted worship on the Lord's Day.[3] For years together during the reign of James there was no divine service celebrated in any of the Established churches throughout the rural districts of Ulster.[4] If "a scandalous maintenance makes a scandalous ministry," it was not extraordinary that the clergy were so disreputable; as, in general, they had a most wretched subsistence. In the times immediately succeeding the Reformation, the revenues appropriated to their support had been seized on by the laity, or in various ways embezzled by dishonest incumbents. The churches over a great portion of the kingdom presented, in consequence, a miserable spectacle of desolation. In 1622 a royal commission reported that seventy-eight churches in the Diocese of Meath were in a state of repair, and one hundred and fifty ruinous.[5] In the united Diocese of Kilmore and Ardagh about one-third of the incumbents were non-resident; fourteen churches were fit for use; and fifty-five were dilapidated.[6] In the Diocese of Derry nine churches were in tolerable order; seven others were new, or in course of erection; and thirty-three partially or totally decayed.[7] In the Diocese of Down and Connor, at the same period, the state of matters was still more deplorable—for only sixteen churches were fit for the celebration of divine ordinances, whilst one hundred and fifty-five churches and chapels were decayed or in ruins.[8]

[1] Mant, i. 355. The reporter is Sir John Davys—who accompanied Chichester on this occasion. See before, p. 473, *note* (1).

[2] Mant, i. 358.

[3] *Ibid.* pp. 378, 399, 400, 402, 404.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 364; Leland, ii. 436.

[5] Mant, i. 399.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 400.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 403.

[8] *Ibid.* p. 407.

When Dublin College was erected it was expected that it would greatly elevate the standard of education in Ireland. It did not produce all the good fruits anticipated, as from the first it was regarded by the Romanists with distrust. Various means were employed by their clergy to dissuade the sons of the nobility and gentry of their communion from accepting its tuition. Some of the children of their higher classes went abroad to be educated in seminaries conducted by the Jesuits, and returned home firmly attached to Popery, and deeply prejudiced against the British government. But it must be admitted that the Reformation contributed much to the cultivation of literature even within the pale of the Church of Rome. The intellect of Ireland now awoke from the slumber of ages, and exhibited abundant proofs of its versatility and vigour. In the controversy between the Jesuits and the Jansenists, Peter Lombard, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Armagh, and Florence Conry, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Tuam,[1] took a prominent part; and distinguished themselves by the subtlety and eloquence with which they advocated their respective views of grace, free will, and predestination.[2] Philip O'Sullivan Beare now wrote his "Catholic History;"[3] and showed how well a gifted son of the Emerald Isle could mingle fiction with facts, and weep over persecutions created by his own fancy. In this reign honest Geoffry Keating also flourished: and produced that "History of Ireland"[4] which will long remain a memorial of his industry, credulity, and superstition.

Though Dublin College was denounced by the Roman

[1] He is said to have been a native of Connaught, and to have been born about 1560. See before, p. 502, *note* (3).

[2] See Brenan, p. 511; and Moran's *Memoir of Lombard*, prefixed to his *Commentarius*, pp. xv-xix.

[3] It was published at Lisbon in 1621. O'Sullivan belonged to a sept settled on the southern coast of Ireland, remarkable for naval daring. See D'Arcy McGee's *Irish Writers of the Seventeenth Century*, p. 24. O'Sullivan's *Historiæ Catholicæ Iberniæ Compendium*, edited by the late Professor Kelly, of Maynooth, was republished in 1850 by Mr. O'Daly of Dublin.

[4] Keating was a native of Munster, and born about 1560. He finished his history about 1625. On one occasion he is said to have involved himself in much trouble by faithfully rebuking a lady of quality belonging to his congregation for gross immorality. See Brenan, p. 511.

Catholic hierarchy, and though some of the arrangements relating to it were alike offensive and unwise,[1] it proved withal a blessing to the country. It already contributed to the Church a small supply of pastors; and, by way of encouragement, the bishops occasionally conferred livings on youths of promise, at the very commencement of their collegiate curriculum, on condition that they would devote themselves to the sacred office.[2] The University promoted a taste for literature; and, during this reign, JAMES WARE, one of the greatest antiquarians Ireland ever produced, was educated within its walls.[3] In 1603 the noble library which belongs to it was founded; and a sum, nearly equal to that required for the erection of the original buildings, was expended on the purchase of books.[4] King James proved a liberal patron; so that, from his reign, it had no longer to struggle with the pecuniary embarrassments which had hitherto interfered with its prosperity.[5] But, for a long time, the attendance on the classes was not very encouraging. During the first twenty-three years of its existence, only fifty-three students were admitted to the degree of Bachelor of Arts.[6] In this reign various schools—intended to supply a good classical education—were erected in Ulster. They obtained, as endowments, valuable grants of landed property

[1] At this time all graduates were required by law to take the oath of supremacy. Heron's *Constitutional History*, p. 26.

[2] Mant, i. 376-7-8.

[3] Ware was knighted in 1629. He frequently represented his Alma Mater in the Irish Parliament. He was born in 1594 and died in 1666.

[4] In 1603 the soldiers employed in the suppression of Tyrone's rebellion raised among themselves £1,800—equal to from £12,000 to £14,000 of our money—to purchase books for the College library. Cox, i. 446.

[5] James settled on the College a pension of nearly £400 a year, payable out of the Exchequer; endowed it with large estates in Ulster; and bestowed on it the patronage of eighteen livings. In 1614, it returned two members to the Irish Parliament. Heron's *Const. Hist. of the University of Dublin*, p. 35.

[6] "The total sum of all the graduates that have commenced in this University from the first foundation thereof to this present year 1616 inclusive, containing the space of twenty-three years, viz:—In Divinity, 7; in Civil Law, 1; in Physic, 1; Bachelors in Theology, 7; Master of Arts, 38; Bachelors of Arts, 53; Bachelors of Music, 2; total graduates, 109"—TAYLOR'S *History of the University of Dublin*, p. 19. Queen's College, Galway, has for so far made much better progress.

belonging to the confiscated estates.[1] By these seminaries, students were provided for the College, and candidates for the ministry.

On the whole, it must be obvious that the Reformed faith exhibited decided indications of vitality in Ireland in the early part of the seventeenth century. Romanism made a bold and persistent effort to maintain its ground; but the Protestant Church was in a much better position to grapple with its adversary at the close of the reign of James than at the close of the reign of Elizabeth.

---

[1] See *Report of the Endowed Schools Commission*, pp. 7-9. It appears that in this reign an endowed school was also established in Longford. *Ibid.* p. 8. Some of the endowments were soon much abused. *Ibid.* p. 10. Some grammar schools were established and endowed by private individuals in this reign. *Ibid.*

APPENDIX I.

(*See p.* 395 *of this volume.*)

A BREFE

Declaration of certein

Principall articles of Re-

ligion: set out by order & aucthoritie as well of the right Honorable Sir Henry Sidney Knyght of the most noble order. Lord presidēt of the Coūcel in the Principallitie of wales and Marches of the same, & general deputie of this Realme of Ireland as by Tharchebyshops, & Byshopes & other her majesties Hygh Commissioners for causes Ecclesiasticall in the same Realme.

Imprynted at Dublin by Humfrey Powel the 20. *of January.* 1566.

THE BOOKE.

A BREFE Declaration of certeine pryncipall Articles of Relygion set out by order and aucthoritie as wel of the Ryght Honorable Sir Henry Sidneye, Knyght of the most noble order, Lord President of the Coūcil in the Principalitie of Wales, and Marches of the same, and generall Deputie of this Realme of Irelande—as by Tharchebyshopes and Byshopes with the rest of her Maiesties Highe Cōmissioners for causes Ecclesiasticall in her Realme of Irelande, for the unitie of Doctrine to be holden and taught of all Persons, Vicars, and Curates, as well intestification of their cōmon consente and full agrement in the said Doctryne, as also nessessarye for the instructiō of their people in their severall Cures, to be read by the said Persons, Vicars and Curates at their possesciō takynge or fyrste entrie into their Cures, and also after that yerelye at two several tymes by the Yere, that is to saye: the Sūdays next folowynge Easterday and Sainct Myghell Tharchangell, and this upō payne of Sequestration, depriation, or other cohercion, as shalbe imposed upon suche as shall herein make default.

ON ARTICLES.

Forasmuche as it appertayneth to all Chrysten men, but especially to the Ministers and the Pastours of the Churche, beyinge teachers and instructours of others, to be readye to geve a reason of their fayth when they shalbe thereunto required: I for my parte now appoynted your Parson, Vicar, or Curate, hauynge before my eyes the feare of God and the testimonye of my conscience, doo acknowledge for my selfe, and require you to assent to the same.

¶ *The fyrste Article.*

Fyrste, that there is but one leuynge and trué God, of infinit power, wyśdome, and goodnesse; the maker and preseruer of al thynges; and that in unitie of this Godhead ther be thre persons of one substance, of equal power and eternitie, the Father, the Sonne, and the holye Ghost.

¶ *The second Article.*

I beleue also what soeuer is conteined in the holye canōical Scriptures, in the which Scripturs are cōteined all thynges necessary to saluation, by the which also al errours and heresies may sufficientlye be reproued and conuicted, and al doctrine and Articles necessarye to saluation established. I doo most firmlye beleue and confesse all the Articles conteined in the three Credes—the Nicene Crede, Athanasius Crede, and our cōmon Creede, called the Apostels Creede, for these doo brefly conteine the principal Articles of our faith, which are at large set foorth in the holye Scriptures.

I acknowledg also the Church to be the Spouse of Christ, wherein the word of God is truely taught, the Sacramētes orderly ministred accoryng to Christes institution, and the aucthoritie of the keiys duely used. And that every such perticuler Churche hath aucthoritie to institute, to chaūg, cleane to put away ceremonies and other ecclesiasticall Rites, as they be superfluōs, or be abused: and to constitute other, makyng more to semelynesse, to order or edification.

¶ *The fourth Article.*

Moreover, I confesse that it is not lawefull for any man to take upon hym anye office or ministerye, eyther ecclesiasticall or seculer, but such onely as are lawefully thereunto called by theyr hyghe aucthorities accordynge to the ordynaunces of this Realme.

¶ *The feyft Article.*

Furthermore, I doo acknowledge the Queene's Maiesties prerogative and superioritie of governmēt of al estates and in all causes, as wel ecclesiastical as temporal, within this Realme, and other her Dominions and Countreyes, to be agreable to Godes wourde, and of right to appertayne to her hyghnes, in such sort as is in the late Act of Parliamēt expressed: and sithens by her Maiesties iniunctions declared and expounded.

The syxt Article.

Moreover, touchynge the Byshope of Rome, I do acknowledg and confesse, that by the Scriptures and worde of God, he hath no more aucthoritie then other Byshopes have in their Provinces and Diosseces; ād therefore the power which he now chalengeth, that is, to be the supreme head of the universal Churche of Christ, and so to be above all Emperours, Kings, and Princes, is an usurped power, contrary to the Scriptures and worde of God, and contrary to the example of the primative Church: and therfore is for most iust causes taken awaye and abolished within this Realme.

The VII. Article.

Furthermore I do graunt and cõfesse, that the boke of cõmon prayer and administration of the holye Sacramentes, set foorth by the auctoritie of Parlyament, is agreable to the Scriptures, and that it is Catholyke, Apostolyke, and most for the advauncynge of Gods glorye and the edifiynge of Gods people, both for y^{t} it is in a toũge, y^{t} may be understãded by y^{e} people, and also for the doctrine and forme of ministration conteyned in the same.

The VIII. Article.

And although in the administration of Baptisme, ther is neither exorcisme, oyle, salte, spittil, or halowynge of the water now used: and for y^{t} they were of late yeres abused and esteemed necessary, where they pertaine not to y^{e} substaunce and necessitie of the Sacramẽt ful and perfectly ministred to al intẽtes and purposes agreable to the institutiõ of our Saviour Christe.

The IX. Article.

Moreover I do not onely acknowledg that privat Masses were never used amõgest the Fathers of the primitive Churche, I mean publique ministration and receavinge of y^{e} Sacramẽt by the Prieste alone without a iust number of cõmunicãtes, accordynge to Christes saying, Take ye and eate ye, &c., but also that the doctrine which maynteinith the Masse to be a propiciatory sacrifice for the quicke and the dead, and a meane to delyver soules out of purgatorye, is neyther agreable to Christes ordynaunce nor grounded upon doctrine Apostolycke, but contrarywise most ungodlye and most iniurious to the precious redemptiõ of our Saviour Christ and his onely sufficient sacrifise offered once for ever upon the alter of the Crosse.

The X. Article.

I am of that mynde also, that the holy Cõmunion or Sacramẽt of the body and bloude of Christ, for the due obedicce to Christes institution, and, to expresse the vertue of the same, ought to be mynistred unto the people under both kyndes, and that it is avouched by certaine fathers of the Church to be a playne sacriledge to robbe them of the misticall cup, for whom Christ hath shed his moste precious bloud: Seyinge he him selfe hath saied, drinke ye all of this. Consyderynge also that in the tyme of the auncyent doctours of the Church, as Ciprian, Jerome, Augustine, Gelasius, and others, vi. hundreth yeares after Christ and more, both the partes of the Sacramente were mynistred unto the people.

The XI. Article.

Last of all as I do utterly disalowe the extollynge of Images, Relicks, and fayned Miracles, and also all kynde of expressinge God invisible in the forme of an olde man, or the holye ghoste in forme of a dove, and al other vayne worshippynge of God devised by mans fantasie, besydes or contrarye to the Scriptures: As wandrynge on pilgrimages, settyne upe of Candels, prayinge upō beades, and such lyke supersticion, which kynde of woorkes have no promyse of rewarde in Scripture, but cōtrary wise, threatnynges and maladictions: So I do exhorte all men to the obedyence of Godes lawe, and to the workes of fayght: As charytie, mercy, pitye, almes, devout and fervent prayer, with thaffection of the hart, and not with the mouth only, godly abstinence and fastynge, chastitie, obedyence to the rulers and superyour powers, with such lyke workes and godlynes of lyfe commaunded by God in his worde, which as Sainte Paule saithe, hath promises both of this lyfe, and of the lyfe to come, and are workes only acceptable in Godes syght.

The XII. Article.

These thynges above rehearsed, though they be appoynted by common order, yet do I without all compulsion, with fredome of mynde and conscience, frome the bottome of my hart and upon most sure perswasion, acknowledge to be true and agreable to Godes worde, And therefore I exhort you al, of whom I have cure, hartelye and obedientlye to embrace and receave the same, that we all ioyning together in unitie of spirit, fayth, and charytie, may also at leangth be joyned together in the kyngdome of God, that through the merites and death of our Saviour Jesus Christe: to whom with the Father and the holy Ghost be all glory and empyre now and for ever.

Imprynted at Dublin in Saint Nycolas Stret, by Humfrey Powell, Prynter appoynted for the Realme of Irelande.

APPENDIX II.

(*See pp.* 477—8, *note* (8), *of this volume.*)

EXTRACTED FROM CALENDAR OF STATE PAPERS. JAMES I. 1606–1608, pp. 17, 18. LONDON, 1874.

SIR JOHN DAVYS *to the* EARL OF SALISBURY, *November 12th*, 1606.

"I met with an Irish scholar, who had been bred in France and Spain, among the fugitives of this nation, and of him I learnt the names and quality of the Pope's titulary bishops of Ireland, and who were present in the Kingdom, and who were absent, and where they resided.

"In Ulster.—Dr. Peter Lumbard (Lombard), born at Waterford, beareth the title of Primate of Ardmagh; he is now at the Court of Rome, where he hath a pension from the Pope of 200 ducats by the month. He hath also the dignity of a provost in the Cathedral church of Cambray.

"One O'Boyle hath the title of Bishop of Rapo (Raphoe) in Tirconnel; he was born in that country, and resideth there, being countenanced by the Earl of Tirconnel.

"Connor O'Dovenny hath the name of Bishop of Downe and Connor; he liveth in Tyrone; we saw him in our last journey when we were near Ulster, for he was brought into the camp in the habit of a Franciscan. Cormock McBaron, the Earl's of Tyrone's brother, is his chief reliever and receiver.

"Richard Brady is the titulary Bishop of Kilmore; he is very aged, and lurketh for the most in Westmeath.

"Jo. Gawne (McGauran) is called Bishop of Ardagh; his abode is uncertain, but he resorteth often to a place called Granard, in the county of Longford.

"Owen McIvor McMahon, one of the sons of Ivor McCollo, who is farmer to my Lord of Essex, in the Ferny (Farney), is designed Bishop of Clogher, but is now in Germany.

"These are the Pope's bishops in Ulster.

"In Leinster.—One Matthias, a Spanish friar, hath the title of Archbishop of Dublin; he now liveth in a monastery in Spain, not far from Madrid; he hath a poor pension of three ducats per diem.

"Franciscus di Rivera is the supposed Bishop of Leighlin; he is now resident at Antwarp (*sic*).

"Robert Lalor, the priest who is now in the Castle of Dublin, and was a follower of the house of Kildare, is nominated Bishop of Kildare.

"In Mounster.—David O'Kerny is made by the Pope Archbishop of Cashell; he liveth in the liberty of Tipperary.

"Thomas White, born in Waterford, and nephew to Dr. Lumbard, the pretended Primate of Armagh, hath the title of Bishop of Waterford. He hath a benefice in the Low Countries, but liveth with his uncle at Rome.

"Dr. James White is called Bishop of Limerick, but resideth at Clonmell in the liberty of Tipperary.

"In Conaght.—Florence O'Mulconner hath the name of Archbishop of Tuame, but liveth in the Court of Spain.

"One O'Mulrian, a native of the County of Limerick, is styled Bishop of Killaloe: he liveth at Lisbon, and hath a pension of the King of Spain. There are some other bishoprics in this Kingdom for which the Pope hath provided bishops, of whom I have no certain intelligence."

APPENDIX III.

(*See p.* 494 *of this volume.*)

ARTICLES OF RELIGION,

AGREED VPON BY

THE ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS,

AND THE REST OF THE CLEARGIE OF IRELAND,

IN

THE CONUOCATION

HOLDEN AT DUBLIN IN THE YEARE OF OUR LORD GOD 1615, FOR THE AUOIDING OF DIUERSITIES OF OPINIONS, AND THE ESTABLISHING OF CONSENT TOUCHING TRUE RELIGION.

PRINTED AT DUBLIN BY JOHN FRANCKTON, PRINTER TO THE KINGS MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTIE.

1615.

ARTICLES OF RELIGION,

AGREED VPON BY

THE ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS,

AND THE REST OF THE CLEARGIE OF IRELAND,

IN THE CONVOCATION HOLDEN AT DUBLIN IN THE YEARE OF OUR LORD GOD 1615, FOR THE AVOIDING OF DIVERSITIES OF OPINIONS AND THE ESTABLISHING OF CONSENT TOUCHING TRUE RELIGION.

Of the Holy Scripture and the three Creeds.

1. The ground of our Religion, and the rule of faith and all sauing trueth is the Word of God, contained in the holy Scripture.

2. By the name of holy Scripture we understand all the Canonicall Bookes of the Old and New Testament, viz. :—

Of the Old Testament.

The five Bookes of Moses.
Iosua.
Iudges.
Ruth.
The first and second of Samuel.
The first and second of Kings.
The first and second of Chronicles.
Esra.
Nehemiah.
Esther.
Iob.
Psalmes.
Prouerbes.
Ecclesiastes.
The Song of Salomon.
Isaiah.
Ieremiah, his Prophesie and Lamentation.
Ezechiel.
Daniel.
The 12 lesse Prophets.

Of the new Testament.

The Gospells according to—
Matthew.
Marke.
Luke.
Iohn.
The Actes of the Apostles.
The Epistle of S. Paul to the Romaines.
Corinthians 2.
Galathians.
Ephesians.
Philippians.
Colossians.
Thessalonians 2.
Timothie 2.
Titus.
Philemon.
Hebrewes.
The Epistle of S. Iames.
Saint Peter 2.
Saint Iohn 3.
Saint Iude.
The Reuelation of S. Iohn.

All which wee acknowledge to be giuen by the inspiration of God, and in that regard to be of most certaine credit and highest authority.

3. The other Bookes, commonly called *Apocryphall*, did not proceede from such inspiration, and therefore are not of sufficient authoritie to establish any point of doctrine; but the Church doth reade them as Bookes containing many worthy things for example of life and instruction of maners.

Such are these following :—

The thirde booke of Esdras.
The fourth booke of Esdras.
The booke of Tobias.
The booke of Iudith.
Additions to the booke of Esther.
The booke of Wisedome.
The booke of Iesus, the Sonne of Sirach, called Ecclesiasticus.
Baruch, with the Epistle of Ieremiah.
The song of the Three Children.
Susanna.
Bell and the Dragon.
The praier of Manasses.
The first booke of Macchabees.
The second booke of Macchabees.

4. The Scriptures ought to be translated out of the originall tongues into all languages for the common use of all mē : neither is any person to be discouraged from reading the Bible in such a language, as he doth vnderstand, but seriously exhorted to read the same with great humilitie and reuerence, as a speciall meanes to bring him to the true knowledge of God, and of his owne duty.

5. Although there bee some hard things in the Scripture (especially such as haue proper relation to the times in which they were first vttered, and prophesies of things which were afterwardes to bee fulfilled), yet all things necessary to be knowen vnto euerlasting saluation are cleerely deliuered therein : and nothing of that kinde is spoken vnder darke mysteries in one place, which is not in other places spoken more familiarly and plainely, to the capacitie both of learned and vnlearned.

6. The Holy Scriptures containe all things necessary to saluation, and are able to instruct sufficiently in all points of faith that we are bound to beleeue, and all good duties that we are bound to practise.

7. All and euerie the Articles contained in the *Nicen Creede*, the *Creede* of *Athanasius*, and that which is commonly called the *Apostles Creede*, ought firmely to bee receiued and beleeued, for they may be proued by most certaine warrant of Holy Scripture.

Of faith in the holy Trinity.

8. There is but one liuing and true God, euerlasting, without body, parts, or passions, of infinite power, wisedome, and goodness, the maker and preseruer of all things, both visible and inuisible. And in vnitie of this Godhead, there be three persons of one and the same substance power and eternitie: the Father, the Sone, and the Holy Ghost.

9. The essence of the Father doth not begett the essence of the Sonne; but the person of the Father begetteth the person of the Sonne, by communicating his whole essence to the person begotten from eternitie.

10. The holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Sonne, is of one substance, maiestie, and glory, with the Father and the Sonne, very and eternall God.

Of God's eternall decree and Predestination.

11. God from all eternitie did by his vnchangeable counsell ordaine whatsoeuer in time should come to passe: yet so, as thereby no violence is offred to the wills of the reasonable creatures, and neither the libertie nor the contingencie of the second causes is taken away, but established rather.

12. By the same eternall counsell God hath predestinated some vnto life, and reprobated some vnto death: of both which there is a certaine number, knowen only to God, which can neither be increased nor diminished.

13. Predestination to life, is the euerlasting purpose of God, whereby, before the foundations of the world were layed, he hath constantly decreed in his secret counsell to deliuer from curse and damnation, those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankinde, and to bring them by Christ vnto euerlasting saluation, as vessels made to honour.

14. The cause mouing God to predestinate vnto life, is not the foreseeing of faith, or perseuerance, or good workes, or of anything which is in the person predestinated, but onely the good pleasure of God himselfe. For all things being ordained for the manifestation of his glory, and his glory being to appeare both in the workes of his Mercy and of his Iustice: it seemed good to his heauenly wisedome to choose out a certaine number towardes whome he would extend his vndeserued mercy, leauing the rest to be spectacles of his iustice.

15. Such as are predestinated unto life, be called according vnto Gods purpose (his spirit working in due season) and through grace they obey the calling, they bee iustified freely, they bee made sonnes of God by adoption, they be made like the image of his onely begotten Sonne Iesus Christ, they walke religiously in good workes, and at length, by God's mercy they attaine to euerlasting felicitie. But such as are not predestinated to saluation, shall finally be condemned for their sinnes.

16. The godlike consideration of Predestination and our election in Christ, is full of sweete, pleasant, and vnspeakeable comfort to godly persons, and such as feele in themselues the working of the spirit of Christ, mortifying the workes of the flesh, and their earthly members, and drawing vp their mindes to high and heauenly things: as well because it doth greatly confirme and establish their faith of eternall saluation to be enioyed through Christ, as because it doth feruently kindle their loue towardes God: and on the contrary side, for curious and carnall persons, lacking the spirit of Christ, to haue continually before their eies the sentence of Gods predestination, is very dangerous.

17. Wee must receiue Gods promises in such wise as they be generally set forth vnto vs in holy Scripture; and in our doings, that will of God is to be followed, which we haue expressly declared vnto us in the word of God.

Of the creation and gouernment of all things.

18. In the beginning of time, when no creature had any being, God by his word alone, in the space of sixe dayes, created all things, and afterwardes by his prouidence doth continue, propagate, and order them according to his owne will.

19. The principall creatures are Angels and men.

20. Of Angels, some continued in that holy state wherein they were created, and are by Gods grace for euer established therein: others fell from the same, and are reserued in chaines of darkenesse vnto the iudgment of the great day.

21. Man being at the beginning created according to the image of God (which consisted especially in the Wisedome of his minde and the true Holyness of his free will) had the couenant of the lawe ingrafted in his heart: whereby God did promise vnto him euerlasting life, vpon condition that he performed entire and perfect obedience vnto his Commandments, according to that measure of strength wherewith hee was endued in his creation, and threatned death vnto him if he did not performe the same.

Of the fall of man, originall sinne, and the state of man before iustification.

22. By one man sinne entred into the world, and death by sinne; and so death went ouer all men, for as much as all haue sinned.

23. Originall sinne standeth not in the imitation of Adam (as the Pelagians dreame) but is the fault and corruption of the nature of euery person that naturally is ingendred and propagated from Adam: whereby it commeth to passe that man is depriued of originall righteousness, and by nature is bent vnto sinne. And therefore, in euery person borne into the world, it deserueth Gods wrath and damnation.

24. This corruption of nature doth remaine euen in those that are regenerated, whereby the flesh alwaies lusteth against the spirit, and cannot bee made subject to the lawe of God. And howsoeuer, for Christs sake there bee no condemnation to such as are regenerate and doe beleeue: yet doth the Apostle acknowledge that in it selfe this concupiscence hath the nature of sinne.

25. The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turne, and prepare himselfe by his owne naturall strength and good workes, to faith, and calling vpon God. Wherefore we haue no power to doe good workes, pleasing and acceptable vnto God, without the grace of God preuenting vs, that we may haue a good will, and working with vs when wee haue that good will.

26. Workes done before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of his spirit, are not pleasing vnto God, for as much as they spring not of faith in Iesus Christ, neither do they make men meete to receaue grace, or (as the Schoole Authors say) deserue grace of congruitie: yea rather, for that they are not done in such sorte as God hath willed and commaunded them to be done, we doubt not but they are sinfull.

27. All sinnes are not equall, but some farre more heynous than others; yet the very least is of its owne nature mortall, and without Gods mercy maketh the offendor lyable vnto euerlasting damnation.

28. God is not the Author of sinne: howbeit he doth not only permit, but also by his prouidence gouerne and order the same, guiding it in such sorte by his infinite wisedome, as it turneth to the manifestation of his owne glory and to the good of his elect.

Of Christ, the mediator of the second Covenant.

29. The Sonne, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from euerlasting of the Father, the true and eternall God, of one substance with the Father, tooke mans nature in the wombe of the blessed Virgin, of her substance: so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and Manhoode were inseparably ioyned in one person, making one Christ very God and very man.

30. Christ in the truth of our nature, was made like vnto vs in all things, sinne only excepted, from which he was cleerely void, both in his life and in his nature. He came as a Lambe without spott, to take away the sins of the world, by the sacrifice of himselfe once made, and sinne (as Saint John saith) was not in him. He fulfilled the law for vs perfectly: For our sakes he endured most greiuous torments immediately in

his soule, and most painefull sufferings in his body. He was crucified, and dyed to reconcile his Father vnto vs, and to be a sacrifice not onely for originall guilt, but also for all our actuall transgressions. He was buried and descended into hell, and the third day rose from the dead, and tooke againe his body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of mans nature: wherewith he ascended into Heauen, and there sitteth at the right hand of his Father, vntill hee returne to iudge all men at the last day.

Of the communicating of the grace of Christ.

31. They are to be condemned, that presume to say that euery man shalbe saued by the law or sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law, and the light of nature. For holy Scripture doth set out vnto vs only the name of Iesus Christ whereby men must be saued.

32. None can come vnto Christ, vnlesse it bee giuen vnto him, and vnlesse the Father drawe him. And all men are not so drawen by the Father that they may come vnto the Son. Neither is there such a sufficient measure of grace vouchsafed unto euerie man whereby he is enabled to come vnto everlasting life.

33. All Gods elect are in their time inseparablye vnited vnto Christ by the effectuall and vitall influence of the holy Ghost, deriued from him as from the head vnto euery true member of his mysticall body. And being thus made one with Christ, they are truely regenerated, and made partakers of him and all his benefits.

Of Iustification and Faith.

34. We are accounted righteous before God, onely for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Iesus Christ, applied by faith: and not for our owne workes or merits. And this righteousnes, which we so receiue of Gods mercie and Christs merits, imbraced by faith, is taken, accepted, and allowed of God, for our perfect and full iustification.

35. Although this iustification be free vnto vs, yet it commeth not so freely vnto vs, that there is no ransome paid therefore at all. God shewed his great mercie in deliuering vs from our former captiuitie, without requiring of any ransome to be payd, or amends to be made on our parts; which thing by vs had been vnpossible to bee done. And whereas all the world was not able of themselues to pay any part towards their ransome, it pleased our heavenly Father of his infinite mercie without any desert of ours, to prouide for vs the most precious merits of his owne Sonne, whereby our ransome might be fully payd, the lawe fulfilled, and his iustice fully satisfied. So that Christ is now the righteousnes of all them that truely beleeue in him. Hee for them payd their ransome by his death. He for them fulfilled the lawe in his life. That now

in him, and by him euerie true Christian man may be called a fulfiller of the lawe: forasmuch as that which our infirmitie was not able to effect, Christs iustice hath performed. And thus the iustice and mercie of God doe embrace each other: the grace of God not shutting out the iustice of God in the matter of our iustification; but onely shutting out the iustice of man (that is to say, the iustice of our own workes) from being any cause of deseruing our iustification.

36. When we say that we are iustified by Faith onely, we doe not meane that the said iustifying faith is alone in man, without true Repentance, Hope, Charity, and the feare of God (for such a faith is dead, and cannot justifie) neither do we meane, that this our act to beleeue in Christ, or this our faith in Christ, which is within vs, doth of it selfe iustifie vs, or deserue our iustification vnto vs, (for that were to account our selues to bee iustified by the vertue or dignitie of some thing that is within our selues:) but the true vnderstanding and meaning thereof is that although we heare Gods word and beleeue it, although we haue Faith, Hope, Charitie, Repentance, and the feare of God within us, and adde neuer so many good workes thereunto: yet wee must renounce the merit of all our said vertues, of Faith, Hope, Charitie, and all our other vertues, and good deeds, which we either haue done, shall doe, or can doe, as things that be farre too weake and vnperfect, and vnsufficient to deserue remission of our sinnes, and our iustification: and therefore we must trust onely in Gods mercie, and the merits of his most dearely beloued Sonne, our onely Redeemer, Sauiour, and Iustifier Iesus Christ. Neuerthelesse, because Faith doth directly send vs to Christ for our iustification, and that by faith given vs of God wee embrace the promise of Gods mercie, and the remission of our sinnes, (which thing none other of our vertues or workes properly doth:) therefore the Scripture vseth to say, that *Faith without workes;* and the auncient fathers of the Church to the same purpose, that *onely Faith* doth iustifie vs.

37. By iustifying Faith wee vnderstand not onely the common beleefe of the Articles of Christian Religion, and a perswasion of the truth of Gods worde in generall: but also a particular application of the gratious promises of the Gospell, to the comfort of our owne soules: whereby we lay hold on Christ, with all his benefits, hauing an earnest trust and confidence in God, that he will be mercifull vnto vs for his onely Sonnes sake. So that a true beleeuer may bee certaine, by the assurance of faith, of the forgiueness of his sinnes, and of his euerlasting salvation by Christ.

A true liuely iustifying faith, and the sanctifying spirit of God, is not extinguished, nor vanisheth away in the regenerate, either finally or totally.

Of sanctification and good workes.

39. All that are iustified, are likewise sanctified: their faith being alwaies accompanied with true Repentance and good Workes.

40. Repentance is a gift of God, whereby a godly sorrow is wrought in the heart of the faithfull, for offending God their mercifull Father by their former transgressions, together with a constant resolution for the time to come to cleaue unto God, and to lead a new life.

41. Albeit that good workes, which are the fruits of faith, and follow after iustification, cannot make satisfaction for our sinnes, and endure the seueritie of Gods iudgement: yet are they pleasing to God and accepted of him in Christ, and doe spring from a true and liuely faith, which by them is to be discerned, as a tree by the fruite.

42. The workes which God would haue his people to walke in, are such as he hath commaunded in his holy Scripture, and not such workes as men haue deuised out of their own braine, of a blinde zeale, and deuotion, without the warrant of the word of God.

43. The regenerate cannot fulfill the lawe of God perfectly in this life. For in many things we offēd all: and if we say, we haue no sinne, wee deceiue our selues, and the truth is not in vs.

44. Not euerie heynous sinne willingly committed after baptisme, is sinne against the holy Ghost, and vnpardonable. And therefore to such as fall into sinne after baptisme, place for repentance is not to be denied.

45. Voluntary workes, besides ouer and aboue Gods commandements, which they call workes of Superrogation, cannot be taught without arrogancie, and impietie. For by them men doe declare that they doe not onely render vnto God as much as they are bound to doe, but that they doe more for his sake then of bounden duty is required.

Of the service of God.

46. Our dutie towards God is to beleeue in him, to feare him, and to loue him with all our heart, with all our minde, and with all our soule, and with all our strength, to worship him, and to giue him thankes, to put our whole trust in him, to call vpon him, to honour his holy Name and his word, and to serue him truely all the dayes of our life.

47. In all our necessities we ought to haue recourse vnto God by prayer: assuring our selues, that whatsoeuer we aske of the Father, in the name of his Sonne (our onely mediator and intercessor) Christ Iesus, and according to his will, he will vndoubtedly grant it.

48. Wee ought to prepare our hearts before wee pray, and vnderstand the things that wee aske when wee pray: that both our hearts and voyces may together sound in the eares of Gods Maiestie.

49. When almightie God smiteth vs with affliction, or some great

calamitie hangeth ouer vs, or any other waighty cause so requireth ; it is our dutie to humble our selues in fasting, to bewaile our sinnes with a sorrowfull heart, and to addict our selues to earnest prayer, that it might please God to turne his wrath from vs, or supplie vs with such graces as wee greatly stand in neede of.

50. Fasting is a with-holding of meat, drincke, and all naturall foode, with other outward delights, from the body, for the determined time of fasting. As for those abstinences which are appointed by publike order of our state, for eating of fish and forbearing of flesh at certaine times and daies appointed, they are no wayes ment to bee religious fastes, nor intended for the maintenance of any superstition in the choise of meates, but are grōūded meerely vpon politicke considerations, for prouision of things tending to the better preseruation of the Commonwealth.

51. Wee must not fast with this perswasion of minde, that our fasting can bring vs to heauen, or ascribe holynesse to the outward worke wrought. For God alloweth not our fast for the worke sake (which of it selfe is a thing meerely indifferent), but chiefly respecteth the heart, how it is affected therein. It is therefore requisit that first before all things we clense our hearts from sinne, and then direct our fast to such ends as God will allow to bee good : that the flesh may thereby be chastised, the spirit may be more feruent in prayer, and that our fasting may bee a testimony of our humble submission to Gods maiestie, when wee acknowledge our sinnes vnto him, and are inwardly touched with sorrowfulnesse of heart, bewailing the same in the affliction of our bodies.

52. All worship deuised by mans phantasie, besides or contrary to the Scriptures (as wandring on Pilgrimages, setting vp of Candles, Stations, and Iubilies, Pharisaicall sects and fained religions, praying vpon Beades, and such like superstition) hath not onely no promise of reward in Scripture, but contrariewise threatnings and maledictions.

53. All manner of expressing God the Father, the Sonne, and the holy Ghost, in an outward forme, is vtterly vnlawfull. As also all other images deuised or made by man to the use of Religion.

54. All religious worship ought to bee giuen to God alone ; from whome all goodnesse, health, and grace ought to be both asked and looked for, as from the very author and giuer of the same, and from none other.

55. The name of God is to be vsed with all reuerēce and holy respect : and therefore all vaine and rash swearing is vtterly to be condemned. Yet notwithstanding vpon lawfull occasions, an oath may be giuen, and taken, according to the word of God, *iustice, iudgement, and truth.*

56. The first day of the weeke, which is the *Lords day*, is wholly to be dedicated unto the seruice of God : and therefore we are bound therein to rest from our common and daily buysinesse, and to bestow that leasure vpon holy exercises, both publike and priuate.

Of the Ciuill Magistrate.

57. The Kings Maiestie vnder God hath the Soueraigne and chiefe power, within his Realmes and Dominions, ouer all manner of persons, of what estate, either Ecclesiasticall or Ciuill, soeuer they bee; so as no other forraine power hath or ought to haue any superiority ouer them.

58. Wee doe professe that the supreame gouernement of all estates within the said Realmes and Dominions, in all causes, as well Ecclesiasticall as Temporall, doth of right appertaine to the Kings highnes. Neither doe we giue vnto him hereby the administration of the Word and Sacraments, or the power of the Keyes: but that prerogatiue onely, which we see to haue been alwaies giuen vnto all godly Princes in holy Scripture by God himselfe; that is, that hee should containe all estates and degree committed to his charge by God, whether they be Ecclesiasticall or Ciuill, within their duty, and restraine the stubborne and euill doers with the power of the Ciuill swoorde.

59. The Pope neither of himselfe, nor by any authoritie of the Church or Sea of Rome, or by any other meanes with any other, hath any power or authoritie to depose the King, or dispose any of his Kingdomes or Dominions, or to authorise any other Prince to inuade or annoy him or his Countries, or to discharge any of his subiects of their allegeance and obedience to his Maiestie, or to giue licence or leaue to any of them to beare armes, raise tumult, or to offer any violence or hurt to his Royal person, state, or gouernement, or to any of his subiects within his Maiesties Dominions.

60. That Princes which be excommunicated or depriued by the Pope, may be deposed or murthered by their subjects, or any other whatsoeuer, is impious doctrine.

61. The lawes of the Realme may punish Christian men with death for heynous and grieuous offences.

62. It is lawfull for Christian men, at the commandement of the Magistrate, to beare armes, and to serve in iust wars.

Of our duty towards our Neighbours.

63. Ovr duty towards our neighbours is, to loue them as ourselues, and to do to all men as we would they should doe to us; to honour and obey our Superiours, to preserue the safety of mens persons, as also their chastitie, goods, and good names; to beare no malice nor hatred in our hearts; to keep our bodies in temperance, sobernes, and chastitie; to be true and iust in all our doings; not to couet other mens goodes, but labour truely to get our owne liuing, and to doe our dutie in that estate of life vnto which it pleaseth God to call us.

64. For the preseruation of the chastitie of mens persons, wedlocke is commaunded vnto all men that stand in need thereof. Neither is there any prohibition by the word of God, but that the ministers of the Church

may enter into the state of Matrimony: they being no where commaunded by Gods Law, either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstaine from marriage. Therefore it is lawfull also for thē, as well as for all other Christian men, to marrie at their owne discretion, as they shall iudge the same to serue better to godlines.

65. The riches and goodes of Christians are not common, as touching the right, title, and possession of the same: as certaine Anabaptists falsely affirme. Notwithstanding euerie man ought of such things as hee possesseth, liberally to giue almes to the poore, according to his ability.

66. Faith giuen, is to be kept, even with Hereticks and Infidells.

67. The Popish doctrine of Equiuocation & mentall Reseruation, is most vngodly, and tendeth plainely to the subuersion of all humaine society.

Of the Church, and outward ministery of the Gospell.

68. There is but one Catholic Church (out of which there is no saluation) containing the uniuersall cōpany of all the Saints that euer were, are, or shalbe, gathered together in one body, vnder one head Christ Iesus: part whereof is already in heaven *triumphant*, part as yet *militant* heere vpon earth. And because this Church consisteth of all those, and those alone, which are elected by God vnto saluation, & regenerated by the power of his spirit, the number of whome is knowen only vnto God himselfe: therefore it is called the *Catholike* or vniversall, and the *Inuisible* Church.

69. But particular and visible Churches (consisting of those who make profession of the faith of Christ, and liue vnder the outward meanes of saluation) be many in number: wherein the more or lesse sincerly according to Christs institution, the word of God is taught, the Sacraments are administred, and the authority of the Keyes is vsed, the more or lesse pure are such Churches to bee accounted.

70. Although in the visible Church the euill bee euer mingled with the good, and sometimes the euill haue chiefe authoritie in the ministration of the word & Sacraments: yet, for as much as they doe not the same in their owne name, but in Christs, and minister by his commission and authority, we may vse their ministry both in hearing the word and in receauing the Sacraments. Neither is the effect of Christs ordinance taken away by their wickednesse: nor the grace of Gods gifts diminished from such as by faith and rightly doe receaue the Sacraments ministered vnto them; which are effectuall, because of Christs institution and promise, although they be ministered by euill men. Neverthelesse it appertaineth to the discipline of the Church, that inquiry be made of euill ministers, and that they be accused by those that haue knowledge of their offences, and finally being found guiltie, by iust iudgement bee deposed.

71. It is not lawfull for any man to take vpon him the office of publike preaching or ministring the Sacraments in the church, vnless hee bee first lawfully called and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to iudge lawfully called and sent, which bee chosen and called to this worke

by men who haue publike authoritie giuen them in the Church, to call and send ministers into the Lords vineyard.

72. To haue publike prayer in the Church, or to administer the Sacraments in a tongue not vnderstood of the people, is a thing plainly repugnant to the word of God, and the custome of the Primitiue Church.

73. That person which by publike denunciation of the Church is rightly cut off from the vnitie of the Church, and excommunicate, ought to bee taken of the whole multitude of the faithfull, as a Heathen and Publican, vntill by Repentance he be openly reconciled and receaued into the Church by the iudgement of such as haue authoritie in that behalfe.

74. God hath giuen power to his ministers, not simply to forgiue sinnes, (which prerogatiue he hath reserued only to himselfe) but in his name to declare and pronounce vnto such as truely repent and vnfainedly beleeue his holy Gospell, the absolution and forgiuenesse of sinnes. Neither is it Gods pleasure that his people should bee tied to make a particular confession of all their knowen sinners vnto any mortall man : howsoeuer any person grieued in his conscience, vpon any speciall cause, may well resorte vnto any godly and learned Minister, to receaue aduise and comfort at his hands.

Of the authoritie of the Church, generall Councells, and Bishop of Rome.

75. It is not lawfull for the Church to ordaine any thing that is contrary to Gods word : neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore although the Church bee a witnesse, and a keeper of holy writt : yet as it ought not to decree any thing against the same, so besides the same ought it not inforce any thing to be beleeued vpon necessitie of saluation.

76. Generall Councells may not be gathered together without the commaundement and will of Princes ; and when they be gathered together (for as much as they be an assembly of men not alwaies gouerned with the spirit and word of God) they may erre, and sometimes haue erred, euen in things pertaining to the rule of pietie. Wherefore things ordained by them, as necessary to saluation, haue neither strength nor authority, vnlesse it may be shewed that they bee taken out of holy Scriptures.

77. Euery particular Church hath authority to institute, to change, and cleane to put away ceremonies and other Ecclesiasticall rites, as they be superfluous, or be abused ; and to constitute other, makeing more to seemelynes, to order, or edification.

78. As the Churches of *Ierusalem*, *Alexandria* and *Antioch* haue erred : so also the Church of *Rome* hath erred, not onely in those things which concerne matter of practise and point of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith.

79. The power which the Bishop of *Rome* now challengeth, to be Supreame head of the vniversall Church of Christ, and to be aboue all Emperours, Kings and Princes, is an usurped power, contrary to the

Scriptures and word of God, and contrary to the example of the Primitiue Church: and therefore is for most iust causes taken away and abolished within the Kings Maiesties Realmes and Dominions.

80. The bishop of Rome is so farre from being the supreame head of the vniuersall Church of Christ, that his workes and doctrine doe plainely discover him to bee *that man of sinne*, foretold in the holy Scriptures, *whoin the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and abolish with the brightnes of his comming.*

Of the State of the old and new Testament.

81. In the Old Testament the Commaundments of the Law were more largely, and the promises of Christ more sparingly and darkely propounded, shaddowed with a multitude of types and figures, and so much the more generally and obscurely deliuered as the manifesting of them was further off.

82. The Old Testament is not contrary to the New. For both in the Old and New Testament euerlasting life is offered to mankinde by Christ, who is the onely mediator betweene God and man, being both God and man. Wherefore they are not to be heard, which faine that the old Fathers did looke onely for trāsitory promises. For they looked for all benefits of God the Father through the merits of his Sonne Iesus Christ, as we now doe: onely they beleeued in Christ which should come, we in Christ already come.

83. The New Testament is full of grace and truth, bringing ioyful tidings vnto mankinde, that whatsoeuer formerly was promised of Christ, is now accomplished: and so in stead of the auncient types and ceremonies, exhibiteth the things themselues, with a large and cleere declaration of all the benefits of the Gospell. Neither is the ministery therefore restrained any longer to one circumcised nation, but is indifferently propounded vnto all people, whether they be Iewes or Gentils. So that there is now no Nation which can truly complaine that they be shut forth from the communion of Saints and the liberties of the people of God

84. Although the Law giuen from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites be abolished, and the Ciuill precepts thereof be not of necessitie to be receaued in any Common-wealth: yet notwithstanding no Christian man whatsoeuer is freed from the obedience of the Commaundments, which are called Morall.

Of the Sacraments of the new Testament.

85. The Sacraments ordained by Christ, be not onely badges or tokens of Christian mens profession: but rather certaine sure witnesses, and effectuall or powerfull signes of grace and Gods good will towards us, by which he

doth worke inuisibly in vs, and not onely quicken but also strengthen and confirme our faith in him.

86. There bee two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospell, that is to say, *Baptisme* and the *Lords Supper.*

87. Those five which by the Church of *Rome* are called Sacraments, to witt, *Confirmation*, *Penance*, *Orders*, *Matrimony*, and *Extreame vnction*, are not to be accounted Sacraments of the Gospell : being such as haue partly growen from corrupt imitation of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures bvt yet haue not like nature of Sacraments with *Baptisme* and the *Lords Supper*, for that they haue not any visible signe or ceremonie ordained of God, together with a promise of sauing grace annexed therevnto.

88. The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed vpon, or to be carried about ; but that we should duely vse them. And in such onely as worthly receaue the same, they haue a wholesome effect and operation ; but they that receaue them vnworthylie, thereby draw iudgement vpon themselues.

Of Baptisme.

89. Baptisme is not onely an outward signe of our profession, and a note of difference, whereby Christians are discerned from such as are no Christians ; but much more a Sacrament of ovr admission into the Church, sealing vnto vs our new birth (and consequently our Iustification, Adoption, and Sanctification) by the communion which we have with Iesus Christ.

90. The Baptisme of Infants is to be retained in the Church, as agreeable to the word of God.

91. In the administration of Baptisme, *Exorcisme*, *Oile*, *Salte*, *Spittle*, and superstitious *hollowing of the water*, are for iust causes abolished : and without them the Sacrament is fully and perfectly administered, to all intents and purposes, agreeable to the institution of our Sauiour Christ.

Of the Lords Supper.

92. The Lords supper is not onely a signe of the mutuall loue which Christians ought to beare one towards another, but much more a Sacrament of our preseruation in the Church, sealing vnto us ovr spirituall nourishment and continuall growth in Christ.

93. The change of the substance of bread and wine into the substance of the Body and Bloud of Christ, commonly called *Transubstantiation*, cannot be proued by Holy Writ ; but is repugnant to plaine testimonies of the Scripture, ouerthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath giuen occasion to most grosse Idolatry and manifold superstitions.

94. In the outward part of the holy Communion, the Bodie and Bloud of Christ is in a most liuely manner *represented* ; being no otherwise pre-

sent with the visible elements than things signified and sealed are present with the signes and seales, that is to say, symbolically and relatiuely. But in the inward and spirituall part the same Body and Bloud is really and substantially *presented* vnto all those who haue grace to receaue the Sonne of God, euen to all those that beleeue in his name. And unto such as in this manner doe worthylie and with faith repaire vnto the Lords table the Bodie and Bloud of Christ is not onely signified and offered, but also truly exhibited and communicated.

95. The Bodie of Christ is giuen, taken, and eaten in the Lords Supper, onely after an heauenly and spirituall manner; and the meane whereby the Body of Christ is thus receaved and eaten is Faith.

96. The wicked, and such as want a liuely faith, although they doe carnally and visibly (as Saint Augustine speaketh) presse with their teeth the Sacrament of the body and bloud of Christ, yet in no wise are they made partakers of Christ; but rather to their condemnation doe eat and drincke the signe or Sacrament of so great a thing.

97. Both the parts of the Lords Sacrament, according to Christs institution and the practise of the auncient Church, ought to be ministered vnto all Gods people; and it is plain sacriledge to rob them of the mysticall cup, for whom Christ hath shed his most precious bloud.

98. The Sacrament of the *Lords Supper* was not by Christs ordinance reserued, carried about, lifted vp, or worshiped.

99. The sacrifice of the Masse, wherein the Priest is said to offer vp Christ for obtaining the remission of paine or guilt for the quicke and the dead, is neither agreeable to Christs ordinance nor grounded upon doctrine Apostolike; but contrarywise most ungodly and most iniurious to that all-sufficient sacrifice of our Sauiour Christ, offered once for euer vpon the Crosse, which is the onely propitiation and satisfaction for all our sinnes.

100. Priuate Masse, that is, the receiuing of the *Eucharist* by the Priest alone, without a competent number of communicants, is contrary to the institution of Christ.

Of the state of the soules of men, after they be departed out of this life: together with the generall Resurrection, and the last Iudgement.

101. After this life is ended the soules of Gods children be presently receaued into Heauen, there to enjoy vnspeakable comforts; the soules of the wicked are cast into Hell, there to endure endlesse torments.

102. The doctrine of the Church of Rome, concerning *Limbus Patrum*, *Limbus Puerorum*, *Purgatorie*, *Prayer for the dead*, *Pardons*, *Adoration of Images and Relickes*, and also *Inuocation of Saints*, is uainely inuented without all warrant of holy Scripture, yea and is contrary vnto the same.

103. At the end of this world the Lord Iesus shall come in the clouds with the Glory of his Father; at which time, by the almightie power of

God, the liuing shalbe changed and the dead shalbe raised; and all shall appeare both in body and soule before his iudgement seat, to receaue according to that which they haue done in their bodies, whether good or evill.

104. When the last iudgment is finished, Christ shall deliyer vp the Kingdome to his Father, and God shalbe all in all.

THE DECREE OF THE SYNOD.

If any Minister, of what degree or qualitie soeuer he be, shall publikely teach any doctrine cõtrary to these Articles agreed upon, If, after due admonition, he doe not conforme himselfe, and cease to disturbe the peace of the Church, let him bee silenced, and depriued of all spirituall promotions he doth enjoy.

FINIS.

END OF VOL. I.

LONDON: R. CLAY, SONS, AND TAYLOR, PRINTERS, BREAD STREET HILL.

JULY 75
N. MANCHESTER,
INDIANA